The Dissertation Committee for Nancy Campbell-Jeffrey certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Social Movement Theory and the Reconstruction of the Past:

A Case Study of Augusto César Sandino and

the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional

Committee:

_____

Gideon Sjoberg, Supervisor

_____

Henry Dietz

_____

Sheldon Ekland-Olson

_____

Lester Kurtz

_____

Michael Young

Social Movement Theory and the Reconstruction of the Past:

A Case Study of Augusto César Sandino and

the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional

by

Nancy Campbell-Jeffrey, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

the University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

August 2005

Acknowledgments

My warmest appreciation to Dr. Gideon Sjoberg for his guidance, encouragement, faith and patience. I would also like to thank Dr. Henry Dietz for his support, guidance and kindness. Many thanks to Dr. Sheldon Ekland-Olson, Dr. Lester Kurtz, and Dr. Michael Young for their comments and suggestions. My gratitude to Dr. John Donahue for his suggestions and assistance in traveling to Nicaragua. Thanks to Cathy McBride for helping me make various helpful contacts in Nicaragua. Additionally, I would like to thank the Institute of Latin American Studies at the University of Texas at Austin and also Trinity University for making it possible for me to make two trips to Nicaragua to gather data.

I am particularly grateful to Roberto Cajina for taking a supportive interest in this project and directing me to key sources of information that were integral to this work. My deepest appreciation also to Tomás Borge, Miguel d'Escoto, and Lautauro Sandino for their guidance in identifying key sources of information and in furthering my understanding of Sandinista points of view. In addition, I am very grateful to Margarita Vanini for her help in utilizing Sandinista documents at the Instituto de Estudio del Sandinismo.

Most importantly, I wish to express my deepest love and gratitude to my daughter, Marisa, and my husband, Russ, for their love, support, and patience throughout this project.

Social Movement Theory and the Reconstruction of the Past:

A Case Study of Augusto César Sandino and

the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional

Publication No._____

Nancy Campbell-Jeffrey, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2005

Supervisor: Gideon Sjoberg

Social movement participants define themselves and their movements historically although current social movement theory tends to ignore this phenomenon This study explores how and why social movement participants reconstruct the past as a part of their movement and how this reconstructed history, or counterpast, stands in opposition to the official history constructed by the dominant group in society. Specifically, the study relies on George Herbert Mead's theory of time in seeking to understand how the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional reconstructed Nicaraguan history and the historical figure of General Augusto César Sandino in order to drive their revolution against the Somoza regime in the 1960s and 1970s. A feature of that reconstruction is that the Sandinistas attributed posthumous charisma (a variation of Max Weber's concept of charisma) to Sandino. Four constructions of history are explored - those by Sandino himself and his supporters, by North Americans, by Anastasio Somoza and his

supporters, and finally, the contemporary Sandinista reconstruction of the past presented in the revolution that was victorious in 1979. The method of investigation is historical research using documents produced by proponents of the four views of history during the respective time periods.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

After eighteen years of struggle, after the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional (FSLN)was victorious and after the Sandinistas had been in power for eleven years, President Daniel Ortega commissioned Ernesto Cardenal to sculpt the image of Augusto César Sandino. The sculpture stands fifty-four feet tall, towering above much of Managua in its place on a hill. It may seem a bit peculiar to those who do not know Nicaragua that the sculpture is metal, black and flat instead of three-dimensional and, perhaps, bronze. But for Nicaraguans, and especially Sandinistas, a fifty-four foot, black, flat Sandino is perfect.

There truly is no other like Sandino. Ernesto Cardenal (1991: x), the sculptor, explains:

> I believe that Augusto César Sandino is the only hero in history who is recognized by his people by his silhouette alone. The silhouette of Sandino is seen everywhere in Nicaragua - on walls, on ramparts, on fences, on curbs, on columns, on bridges, and even on electric and telephone posts.
> Furthermore, Sandino is a unique historical case: an assassinated hero who fifty years later rises again incarnated in an entire people and defeats those who had assassinated him. And thus he continues to live.

So, it is the silhouette, the flat, the sometimes red, sometimes black Sandino that people use as a shorthand for a world of meaning about themselves, their leaders, their enemies, and their history. And the people that create the Sandino silhouettes are his, as Cardenal says. It is somewhat irrelevant that he is dead.

The Sandinista National Liberation Front looks back to a time when United States Marines occupied Nicaragua as the US State Department, in concert with US multinational companies, directed Nicaraguan politics and the Nicaraguan economy with one lone patriot and his followers standing against the overwhelming power of the aforementioned forces. According to this construction of reality by the FSLN, Sandino and his Army in Defense of the National Sovereignty of Nicaragua were the Nicaraguans who loved Nicaragua enough and believed in themselves enough, even in the face of enormous odds, to risk and sacrifice their lives for the homeland.

The contemporary Sandinistas provide a dramatic case study for the exploration of the role of the past in social movements. The leadership of the Sandinistas recovered the example and thought of General Augusto César Sandino, dead for twenty years when they began, and reconstructed him into an historical figure that was much more than just an example. Sandino is not just a national hero. Sandino is more akin to a phenomenon. The contemporary Sandinistas write about him, write to him, sing about him, sing to him, praise him, and pledge loyalty to him and to his memory and mission; and they have done all those things an unknowable number of times since they began to study his thought almost fifty years ago. Most importantly for this study, they made him an integral part of their social movement.

Social movement theory tends to ignore the role that the past plays in movements in terms of how movement participants understand the past. Theorists have spent a lot of time and effort placing specific movements into history, but that activity is performed by the theorists and researchers without an appreciation for how participants view the situation. Therefore, this study will explore new theoretical ground in understanding the

reconstruction of the past by movement participants. Preliminary development of a theory of the counterpast will, hopefully, contribute to the impressive body of theoretical work explaining social movements.

George Herbert Mead's theory of time contributes to explaining how movement participants understand history as it allows individuals to reconstruct the past in light of the present. Mead's theory aids in explaining the process of reconstructing the past and the need for it. His ideas shed light on movement participants' understanding of the past, the enlistment of that reconstructed past in movement ideology and action, and also on the relationship of that reconstructed past to the movements' opponents. The participants in a social movement will understand history in a fundamentally different way than will their opponents. If they agreed with the history put forth by their opponents, there would be no need for a movement.

As movement participants construct and present their reconstruction of history, they will encounter resistance to that reconstructed history because it will not serve the interests of the dominant group. In fact, the social movement's reconstruction of the past will be a counter-past. The dominant group has a powerful edge in that it has already constructed, disseminated and maintained its official history and, by virtue of its dominant status, has the power to discourage or censor any other proposed histories. Therefore, the movement enters into a struggle over socio-cultural patterns as well as a struggle over its particular concerns such as more equal distribution of economic or political resources. Since Mead's theory does not address the reconstruction of history with regard to power relationships, Alain Touraine's contributions addressing control of the production of knowledge, in this case historical knowledge, is extremely useful.

Within the phenomenon of reconstructing the past by social movements, Weber's theory of charisma is useful in beginning to explain the Sandinistas' treatment of Sandino long after his murder.

A crucial feature of the Sandinista Revolution in Nicaragua is their reconstruction of Nicaraguan history that constitutes a counterpast to the official past maintained by the Somoza regime. Within this counterpast, the Sandinistas reconstruct Sandino as not only an historical hero figure, but also reconstruct him as if he were charismatic even though he is long dead. Just the invocation of Sandino's name is counter to the Somoza government. Yet the Sandinistas do more than simply use his name in their revolution and manage, ultimately, to overthrow the dictatorship as the "descendants of Sandino" (Fonseca, 1981: 38).

The goal of this study is to understand how members of social movements, specifically the Frente Sandinista Liberación Nacional, define themselves and their movement historically. In order to explore this question, the study considers how the FSLN reconstructed history in opposition to the history constructed by the Somoza regime and how both of these histories relate to histories constructed by the early Sandinistas and the United States. A related goal is to explore the possibility of the existence of posthumous charisma by studying the recovery of General Sandino's image by the FSLN and employment of that image in their movement.

A Preview of the Study

Chapter Seven will investigate the FSLN's construction of Sandino's image. However, first, it is very instructive to understand the images with which the FSLN's understanding of Nicaraguan history, and Sandino specifically, compete. The three

constructions of Sandino that precede the FSLN's reconstruction are presented here in a historical, narrative form. It is necessary to let Sandino and his followers, the United States and the Somoza regime act as speakers telling their own respective stories about Sandino. Their narratives, from their perspectives, are data in themselves for purposes of this study. The stories each speaker tells contributes to the ultimate reconstruction of history offered by the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional. Therefore, presentation of the first three constructions of history will be offered with little interpretation or analysis so that the speakers' voices are allowed to communicate what the contemporary Sandinistas would have also heard when they began their reconstruction of the past.

Chapter Two offers a review of social movement theory as well as sociological theory regarding charismatic leadership. More specifically, the discussion centers on the necessity of social movement theory to consider Mead's theory of time as it relates to how movement participants reconstruct history in such a way as to give their movement meaning, continuity and a future. Within this discussion, there is also the possibility that charisma, in the Weberian sense, may be reconstructed for a deceased person.

Chapter Three provides an overview of Nicaraguan history. This rendition of Nicaragua's history focuses on the period 1926 through 1979 although there is some discussion of pre-1926 and post 1979. The information is largely about the Nicaraguan political and economic situation during the period in question because the original and contemporary Sandinistas focus on those institutions. It is included in this work to provide a brief orientation to the sweep of Nicaraguan history as several scholars understand it.

Chapters Four, Five and Six will allow three constructions of Sandino and Nicaraguan history to unfold chronologically and in narrative form. The multiple images of Sandino and Nicaragua from his time period present a complex construction of reality and a foundation for the Sandinistas of the 1960s and 1970s to construct a counterpast to drive their revolutionary movement. Persons of every view regarding Sandino either assign charismatic qualities to or, at least, recognize the charismatic relationship he has with his followers. The following narrative relies heavily on documents originally produced by the characters or entities named above and is supplemented by information from secondary sources.

There are, at least, three constructed images of Sandino and Nicaraguan history to which the contemporary FSLN responds as it reconstructs the past. These three images were constructed at the time Sandino was living and leading his revolt and then just after his death. Chapter Four allows Sandino to present an image of himself. Sandino's image of himself is that he is of the people and is a defender of the oppressed, no matter what the cost. He wrote many letters, statements, manifestos and gave several interviews that included remarks about himself as well as his view of Nicaraguan history. Flowing from Sandino's self-image, Sandino's followers and those who sympathize with his struggle construct a Sandino who is courageous, nationalistic, loyal and deserving of respect if not devotion. These persons include not only Nicaraguans but Latin Americans from a variety of nations. Both the detractors and followers/sympathizers have left documents produced in the 1920s and 1930s, and from time to time, are also quoted in the New York Times.

Chapter Five recognizes that persons from the United States present a variety of Sandinos to the American public. The US military, the US State Department, and US businesses label him a bandit and an outlaw. Some private citizens, members of academia, and members of Congress treat him and his revolt as a Nicaraguan concern that is not an appropriate concern for US marine intervention. The New York Times (especially reporter Harold Denny) usually, but not always, presents Sandino as the bandit that the Coolidge and Hoover administrations say he is. However, Carlton Beals of The Nation constructs a more sympathetic and romantic image of Sandino.

Lastly, Chapter Six addresses how Sandino's Nicaraguan opposition paints him as wholly traitorous and dangerous. Most notable among his Nicaraguan detractors is General Anastasio Somoza García, who is, of course, his principal Nicaraguan political and military foe. It will be Somoza's constructed image of Sandino and Nicaraguan history that will become the official history after Sandino's murder. However, the Somozas generally do their best to ignore Sandino. Theirs will be the history against which the contemporary Sandinistas will construct their counterpast.

Chapter Seven allows the members of the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional to reconstruct Nicaragua's history and to reconstruct General Augusto César Sandino. Unlike the original Sandinistas, the contemporary Sandinistas produced a multitude of documents in their process of reconstructing the past. Key documents demonstrate that they not only recovered Sandino from Nicaraguan history but used this history as a tool in making their revolution. In this sense, the construction of a counterpast was necessary to the Sandinista movement's existence and ultimate victory.

Methodological Note

The Nicaraguan revolution of 1979 and Augusto César Sandino's role as a major "participant" in that event provide a case study to generate theoretical principles useful for interpretations of social movements. The theoretical question concerns the reconstruction of the past and the use of it and charisma in these movements. The empirical question then becomes one of discerning which data will provide the necessary insights. Of particular concern in this study is the imputation of charisma to a deceased man by living revolutionaries and the present need to reconstruct that part of Nicaragua's past to provide meaning for their revolution.

Nicaraguan history and Sandino's place in it have been reconstructed by persons other than himself. Because charisma is a relationship between leader and followers, we must consider Sandino's presentation of self as well as to his followers' image of him. However, we must look to his contemporary Sandinista followers to determine the role of the historical Sandino and his charisma in the revolution of 1979. In order to accomplish this task, the imputations of charisma must be demonstrated at two distinct points in time. First, there must be evidence that Sandino was charismatic during his struggle against foreign intervention in the 1930s. Second, there must be discussion of the reconstruction of the historical Sandino and his charisma by the contemporary Sandinistas.

My treatment of how the early Sandinistas viewed their leader and how the later Sandinistas presented him to the Nicaraguan population will be preceded by an historical overview of Nicaragua. Admittedly, I am subject to Mead's phenomenon of spreading the present backward in order to provide meaning. Nevertheless, it is important to understand something of the foreign intervention that Nicaragua has experienced.

Secondary sources were used to compile this history and then integrated into a sociological framework.

In order to understand the Sandinista revolutionaries' reconstruction of history, it is necessary to first provide the three principal historical constructions with which their history must contend. Each of these three constructions - Sandino's, the North Americans' and Somoza's - will be from their respective points of view using their words. As stated previously, these three histories will be narrative with little analysis so that the three "speakers" may present their own constructions. Thus, I am generally identifying the beginning point for this reconstruction at the beginning of Sandino's military career in 1926. The end point will be the victory of the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional in 1979.

Sandino, a few of his followers, and some sympathizers will tell the story of Sandino in Chapter Four. In order to understand how Sandino views himself and how his contemporaries view him, documents written by him and his contemporaries are used. Numerous letters and manifestos written by Sandino are available in several collected works and provide a wealth of data in which Sandino describes himself and his struggle.[1] In addition, Sandino revealed himself in a few interviews and, in some cases, formally endorsed works written about him. Weaving together Sandino's comments about himself, as they appear in the various letters, manifestos and interviews in these

[1] The most comprehensive collection of Sandino's writings is Sergio Ramírez' edition of El pensamiento vivo, 1981 in two volumes. Other collections of Sandino's writing include Sandino: The Testimony of a Nicaragua Patriot, 1921-1934, 1990, edited by Robert Edgar Conrad; Sandino es indohispano y no tiene fronteras en América Latina,1984, edited by the Institute for the Study of Sandinism; Escritos literarios y documentos desconicidos, 1980, edited by Jorge Eduardo Arellaño and Sandino Without Frontiers, 1980, edited by Karl Bermann.

collections provides a narrative of Sandino. The documents are examined in the chronological order in which they were written in order to capture Sandino's self image over time, but they do not, in any way, constitute a narrative as they are. A few works written by people who knew Sandino but who wrote after his death, were used to furnish a bit more of the story of the General.[2] Sources cited by Carlos Fonseca and Tomás Borge, two of the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional's founders, are key sources because they note that the sources were key to their understanding of Sandino. Most of the same documents used here have been used extensively in other studies but not to tell exactly this story. Secondary sources fill in a few gaps in the story told by Sandino and his contemporaries.[3]

At the same time that Sandino was writing and presenting an image of himself, United States officials were also constructing an image of him. As they fought a war against him, US diplomats and military leaders provided statements to the press about Sandino, which the press then reported to the North American public. In addition, reporters on the scene in Nicaragua contributed to the North American construction of General Sandino. As the "paper of record" the New York Times had the resources to get the Nicaragua story and deliver it to more than a local readership. The Times even maintained a reporter in Managua. Therefore, all Times stories that were about

[2] The great majority of documents for the chapters about Sandino, Somoza and the contemporary Sandinistas were written in Spanish. Translations of works cited that are written in Spanish are mine. When citing English translations of works originally written in Spanish, the English version is cited.

[3] Neill Macaulay's The Sandino Affair is an informative history of Sandino's struggle. Also very helpful are Gregorio Selser's works Sandino, General de los hombres libres and El pequeño ejército loco.

Nicaragua or Sandino and that appeared between 1926 and 1934 were examined and the highlights used to tell the story of the US War in Nicaragua and of Sandino as it was presented to the American public. Other sources such as The Nation, a few journal articles, and books written by US diplomat Henry Stimson and Marine General Smedley Butler supplement the information from the Times. As with the documents used to discuss Sandino, the documents used to understand the construction of Sandino in the US are dated between 1926 and 1934.

In order to outline the official history maintained by the Somoza regime, Somoza García's book about Sandino is clearly used as a principal source in Chapter Six. Quotes from Nicaraguans about what they remember knowing about Sandino and what they knew of official history provide another view. Since media and education are important ways in which official history is spread and maintained throughout a population, data regarding the messages offered by media and education in Nicaragua during the Somoza period are presented. Included in these data are history books endorsed by Somoza himself and a school textbook of the period. These works not only discuss Nicaraguan history, and perhaps Sandino, but also present an official construction of Somoza. Secondary data regarding the state of media and education in Somoza's Nicaragua are included. In addition, works by non-Sandinista opponents of the Somoza regime are presented in order to provide another picture of Somoza and his official history. The works used in this chapter were all written and/or published between 1936 (the year of Somoza's ascent to the Nicaraguan presidency) and 1979.[4]

[4] The exceptions are two histories written prior to 1936 but formally endorsed by the Somoza regime as presidentially approved histories of Nicaragua.

Finally, the contemporary Sandinistas and their reconstruction of history appear in Chapter Seven. As the key figure in the recovery and reconstruction of Sandino, Carlos Fonseca and his works are the focus of the chapter. Many of his works appear in a collection compiled by the Institute for the Study of Sandinism, but various works also appear in other edited books or are available as individual booklets.[5] Other key documents written by Sandinista leaders include books by Tomás Borge, Humberto Ortega, Sergio Ramírez, and Jaime Wheelock. In addition to works by these leaders are works by Sandinistas Germán Pomares, Omar Cabezas and an interview with Francisco Rivera. The great majority of works used in this chapter were written between 1955 and 1979 with only a few exceptions. Sandinista propaganda (newspapers, flyers) produced during the revolutionary period are used here to illuminate how the Sandinistas communicated their reconstruction of Sandino to a broader audience in Nicaragua and outside the country. During two trips to Nicaragua, informal conversations with a few Sandinistas were crucial in the process of identifying most of the key documents used in this study to weave the stories of Sandino's image of himself and the contemporary Sandinista reconstruction of him.

In all four cases of the construction of history, the presentations here of those four histories is based on the four "speakers" writings. Therefore, it will be their view and testimony of what happened and why. Given that stories may change in the telling, memories are re-interpreted with time and original information upon which they base their constructions may have been faulty, there are periodically some factual errors in the

[5] Fonseca's works include letters, speeches, articles, manifestos, research and booklets.

various presentations. However, this study does not seek any objective truth about Nicaraguan history but how various actors construct it. So, from time to time, discrepancies in information will be noted, but only to give more information to the reader. Any discrepancies simply become part of the story of the reconstruction of history, and they make it even more interesting.

A Word About Style

This study is unusual in that it permits historical figures to tell their stories in narrative form, using data they themselves produced in various documents. This approach allows the reader to see the stories build upon one another, or contradict one another, over time so that the reader understands to some degree what the contemporary Sandinistas understood of Nicaraguan history when they undertook their reconstruction of the past. This method of data presentation also demonstrates some of the messiness of history, which is the reality when historical evidence is not organized into neat, analytical categories by the social scientist. In fact, the stories of Sandino as told by Sandino and the North Americans seem quite messy because the stories are told as events are happening. Furthermore, Sandino, in particular, is not writing in narrative format and so is not telling a smooth, flowing story. The collections of his letters and manifestos are not meant to tell a narrative. Therefore, to some degree, I reconfigure an abundance of quotes into story form, although not quite of the literary sort. Again, I do smoothe the story somewhat by providing background information from secondary sources.

In contrast, the stories told by Somoza and the Sandinistas are somewhat simpler, more ordered and shorter because they benefit from looking back and summarizing events of the past. On the other hand, given the amount of data available, I

too have certainly done significant winnowing of material to bring brevity and some order to the story. Only light threads of sociological analysis run through Chapters Four, Five and Six in contrast to the discipline's norm of immediate and extensive analysis of each construction of history. Summaries of each story end these three chapters, as well as a very brief analysis. More extensive analysis appears in Chapter Seven about the contemporary Sandinistas and in the conclusion since, after all, the focus of the study is how a movement reconstructs history for movement purposes.

Building on the Body of Work

Numerous fine studies of the recovery of Sandino by the contemporary Sandinistas have been written, particularly during the late 1980s and early 1990s. In fact, this study builds upon two brief works that I wrote in the late 1980s. With increasing distance in time from the revolutionary victory in 1979, the volume of studies on this revolution may have decreased somewhat. On the other hand, the distance is bringing fresh perspectives and analysis.[6] The theory of George Herbert Mead, coupled with the theory of Alain Touraine, and then that of Max Weber provide a new theoretical foothold in understanding and explaining the Sandinista Revolution and other social movements. It is not the purpose of this study to ferret out the objective truth of who Sandino was, but to understand how a reconstructed General Sandino and reconstructed Nicaraguan history illustrate that the past is contested terrain in the social movement arena.

[6] In particular, see David E. Whisnant, 1995.

CHAPTER II

MOVEMENTS AND THE PAST

Tomás Borge (1984: 163) calls him the "lamp of national dignity and the sower of irreversible dreams." Incredibly, Borge is speaking in the 1980s of a man whom the Sandinistas of Nicaragua consider to be their leader, but who died in 1934. The man was or is Augusto César Sandino. Contemporary Sandinistas bestow upon him several other names such as "the General of Free Men" (Sandino, 1981: 43), "a redeemer" (Sandino, 1981: 52), "the most outstanding founding father" (Fonseca, 1981: 26), "a banner in all Latin America" (Sandino, 1981: 42), "the immortal patriot" (Fonseca, 1981: 412), "the greatest hero" (Pérez-Valle, 1980: 7), "the most illustrious son of the Nicaraguan people" (Fonseca, 1980: 13), and "our beloved founder" (Borge, 1980: 15).

The interesting element in the recurrent Sandinista references to this deceased person is that the contemporary Sandinistas are committed to a man and his cause even though the man is long dead. Only one of the founders of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) knew Sandino in the 1930s. Yet their attitude appears to be more than one of respect for a deceased national hero. In fact, the Sandinistas' references to a Sandino who died a generation earlier are similar to remarks followers might make about a living charismatic leader. This phenomenon becomes all the more interesting since the Sandinistas initiated a social movement - a revolution - in the name of Augusto César Sandino and his ideas, and they succeeded in the overthrow of the Somoza government in 1979.

The incorporation of Sandino, a figure from the past, into the strategy of the FSLN raises questions concerning the relationship of the past to the present. To date, scholars have given considerable attention to how past events led to or caused social movements/revolution. Scholars also address the movement's place in history. However, little scholarly attention has been given to the question of how movement participants view their own history and how their historical understanding affects the course of their movement and the larger society. This study will explore the theoretical issues regarding the interaction of past and present in social movements and the substantive case of Sandino and the Nicaraguan revolution.

Statement of the Problem

The relationship between the contemporary Sandinistas and the deceased Sandino provides a case study for generating theoretical principles concerning the role of the past in social movements. This role is largely ignored in the social movement literature. Maines, Sugrue, and Katovich (1983) make a sketchy attempt to discuss the utility of the creation of a past by social movement participants in order to gain a power advantage. Otherwise, social movement theorists do not explore the relationship of the past to present movement strategy and success or failure. For example, traditional collective behavior theory treats movements as temporally isolated and certainly does not consider historical understanding on the part of the movement's participants (Smelser, 1962). Symbolic interactionists such as Zurcher and Snow (1981) and Snow, et al (1986) neglect the possibility that individuals as well as collections of individuals in movements form and re-form their perceptions of the past as a result of social interaction and that this past has a profound impact on the movement. The post-structuralist Alain Touraine

(1981) argues that entire societies reflect and, employing their systems of knowledge, re-shape and change using social movements as the primary agents of this change. However, he does not address the same process of "historicity," as he calls the process of reflection and change, within the social movement. Neither does resource mobilization theory consider that movements must reconstruct a past that is meaningful on a personal and on a group level. Charles Tilly (2004) argues strenuously that each social movement must be understood in historical context and, furthermore, social movements as a socio-political phenomenon must be placed in historical context. Although necessary and extremely useful, it still does not consider the participants' understanding of history. The political process model (McAdam, 1982) does not consider collective historical understanding but is perhaps the model best suited to consider such understanding as it emphasizes the subjective understanding by movement participants of political processes as well as emphasizing forces in the larger social structure.

The emergence of the resource mobilization perspective constituted an alternative to and critique of other forms of collective behavior theory such as the contagion (LeBon, 1982; Blumer, 1937), emergent norm (Turner & Killian, 1957), and value-added (Smelser, 1962) perspectives. Each of these earlier theories assumed that social movements tend to occur during times of social stress. Yet these theories could not specify the amount of stress necessary to cause collective behavior/social movements nor why collective behavior episodes occurred during some periods of stress and not during others. Resource Mobilization provided a remedy to many of the shortcomings of earlier theories. However, as McAdam (1982) argues, the weakness of the Resource Mobilization model lies in its vague definition of resources and its failure to allow for

variation among people regarding their subjective assignment of meaning to their situations.

Traditional Collective Behavior Theory

Early collective behavior theories assumed that collective behavior episodes, including social movements, occurred during times of social stress or strain and were rather spontaneous, unconventional responses to that stress. Theories such as contagion (LeBon, 1960; Blumer, 1937), emergent norm (Turner & Killian, 1957), and value-added (Smelser, 1962) also assumed that collective actions were somewhat of a social pathological response to perceived problems in the social structure. Nevertheless, these theories (especially value-added and emergent norm theories) did make some important contributions to the understanding of movements.

Smelser's value-added theory (1962) provided a much more complex analysis of collective behavior than had been offered by the early theories. Of primary importance was Smelser's acknowledgment of elements in the social environment that influenced the potential for collective behavior. The impression given by early theories was that collective behavior participants were suffering from a mental disorder or, at least, a momentary mental lapse which led them to act collectively in an emotional and destructive way. Smelser, on the other hand, allows that structural elements, such as whether or not a societal structure is open or conducive to collective behavior and whether or not there is a disruption or strain in the social structure, are central to understanding the collective behavior phenomenon. His value-added theory also outlines the importance of how participants perceive the structural strain and its specific manifestation in their lives and then how participants perceive a solution to the problem.

Even though Smelser implies that the participants' perception of the problem and choice of collective behavior as the solution are not generally the best or correct perceptions and solutions, the generalized belief concept as a determinant of collective behavior does begin to address the benefits of understanding the participants' definition of the situation rather than the observer simply declaring how participants' must be viewing the problem.

In their discussion of crowd behavior, Turner and Killian (1957) argue that crowd behavior arises from cultural conflict, or a conflict between normative systems, rather than an absence of culture as implied in earlier theories. This view tends toward allowing that collective behavior participants are rational actors. In fact, crowds adopt a normative system of their own as they act together. However, while giving a nod to the rational behavior of crowd members, Turner and Killian still suggest that crowds are essentially destructive and hint at contagion theory when they write that crowd members are highly suggestible. Finally, neither Smelser nor Turner and Killian give attention to the notion that collective behavior participants interpret the past in specific ways that color their participation in collective behavior.

Resource Mobilization

The resource mobilization perspective has been widely used by social movement scholars in the United States. The resource mobilization approach proposed by Zald and Ash in 1964 differs greatly from the aforementioned "breakdown" theories (Tilly, 1975). The new theory focuses on how social movements gain resources, how social movements are organized, how the movements acquire participants, and how movement participation is maintained. In contrast to earlier theories, resource mobilization assumes that there is constant and sufficient social stress to allow for the emergence of a social movement.

While resource mobilization theory does address some of the deficiencies of earlier movement theory, its utilitarian analysis exaggerates the role of self-interest in movement participation and ignores the role of interpersonal commitment (Zurcher & Snow, 1981; Gamson, 1988). Even though resource mobilizationists admit that the opinions and beliefs of participants are to be considered in their analysis, these elements are subsumed under the organizational component of social movements. Consequently, resource mobilization analysis is of little value in understanding how a movement begins and coalesces, but is of great value as an analysis of how movement organizations are maintained or disappear.

The identification of the abovementioned difficulties with the resource mobilization approach is certainly not exhaustive.[7] In addition to other weaknesses of the theory, this perspective does not account for a reconstruction of the past by movement participants. Resource mobilization theorists sometimes discuss the importance of understanding social movements in historical context, but fail to realize that the past must be personally meaningful to movement participants (Gamson, 1975; McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Tilly, 1978).

Since the theories do not address the reconstruction of history as part of a movement, they certainly do not explain a phenomenon such as the relationship of living movement participants to deceased leaders such as Sandino. Resource mobilization may consider leaders to be resources and might even look upon the movement's dead as "resources," but even this consideration does not capture the relationship between

[7] For more thorough critiques, see McAdam, 1982 & Gamson 1988.

followers and a dead leader as the relationship of present to past. For scholars like McCarthy and Zald, the relationship of present participants to what they perceive as their past is not necessary to the initiation or success of a movement. Thus, a central purpose of this study is to address this theoretical inadequacy by documenting the reconstruction of Nicaragua's past by social movement participants and in opposition to the official history offered by Nicaraguan institutions during the reign of the Somozas. Within this larger purpose, there is the particular instance of the Sandinistas' historical reconstruction of a once charismatic leader for their own revolution.

Frame Alignment

Unlike resource mobilization theory, frame alignment gives much attention to the meaning that individuals attach to social movements and to participation in social movements. Snow and his colleagues (1986: 464) argue that frame alignment is "the linkage of individual and [social movement organization or] SMO interpretive orientations, such that some set of individual interests, values and beliefs and SMO activities, goals, and ideology are congruent and complementary" and that "frame alignment is a necessary condition for movement participation." Therefore, frame alignment makes strides in explaining the role of grievance interpretation in micromobilization. The perspective allows for varying interpretations of the grievance and the social movement's role across individuals and social movement organizations as well as allowing that participation in a movement is constantly subject to reconsideration and renegotiation.

In spite of its strengths regarding the role of individual interpretation in movement participation, frame analysis lacks an understanding of the relationship

between participants, movements, and history. Benford and Hunt (1992: 37) mention that the dramaturgical approach focuses on "social acts and emergent meanings." In other words, the authors recognize that the social construction and communication of meaning are dynamic processes rooted in social interaction. However, these scholars generally do not allow social movement actors, whether they be individuals or organizations, to have a sense of history or historical meaning. There is some mention of religious movements and some secular movements having some consciousness of themselves as linked to “some grand prophecy or moment in the past” (Hunt, Benford, & Snow, 1994; 195). However, the discussion is brief and ends with the idea that such “framings...mark and bound a movement and its activities in space and time” as part of the construction of movement identity (Hunt, et al, 1994; 195).

The concept of collective identity as outlined by Hunt and Benford (2004) has some potential for explaining a movement participant’s sense of history, but consistently misses the opportunity. They do mention Mead in their latest work but only regarding how his theory of self and society relates to collective identity construction with no mention of his theory of time. Snow (2004: 404) also approaches Mead’s ideas as he states that “imputed or constructed meanings are not fixed or static but are subject to change as the social context changes.” Again, though, the approach falls short of considering time. Certainly, the scholars do not place the actors in historical context, and they only recently allow the actors themselves to consider and explain their personal histories in the context of the grievance or the need for the social movement. Nevertheless, these actors only give scant consideration and explanation to their histories in the frame analysis scheme. The actors in frame analysis are largely present oriented;

they assign meaning based on present needs and circumstances and play their roles without much consideration for what has gone before and the meaning attached to the past. Indeed, it seems that they have no past. Neither do they necessarily have a future even though Benford and Hunt (1992: 38) mention that dramaturgy may also "be used to analyze...the ebb and flow of social change." As framing and dramaturgy have been developed thus far, they cannot explain social change because they do not incorporate social construction of past and future in their interpretative categories with regard to movement participation. This perspective only addresses how actors may alter their interpretations of the grievance, situation, or power from moment to moment based upon their interactions. The perspective does not give attention to the Meadian understanding of the reconstruction of the past and to actors as historical beings in relation to social movements.

Political Process Model

The political process model of social movements offers an alternative to the aforementioned movement theories by emphasizing the waxing and waning political opportunities available to collectivities with political or social grievances. The model also allows that collectivities may or may not perceive and, therefore, act upon political opportunities. As stated by Marx and McAdam (1994: 84), "The basic idea is that social movements develop in response to an increase in the 'structure of political opportunities' available to a particular challenging group."

Particularly crucial to political process theory is this idea that there must be a "significant transformation in the collective consciousness of the actors involved" (McAdam, McCarthy, & Zald, 1988: 713). The idea is not new. In fact, it follows in the

tradition of such concepts as class consciousness (Marx, 1986), generalized beliefs (Smelser, 1962), and frame alignment (Snow, et al, 1986). The political process version of the phenomenon explicitly recognizes that structural problems and opportunities are not enough to create movements. Furthermore, "mediating between opportunity and action are people and the subjective meanings they attach to their situations" (McAdam, 1982; 48). The actors, also known as challengers (Gamson, 1975), may perceive a political shift in their favor and, if there is to be a social movement, must collectively define situations as unjust and subject to change through collective action. Critical to the initiation of collective action is the requirement that challengers must make "system attributions" in order to explain their grievances (McAdam, 1982). At this point, the actors are "adopting an injustice frame" (Gamson, et al 1982) and achieving "cognitive liberation" (McAdam, 1982).

The political process model has several strengths. First, it recognizes that the political opportunities for challengers rise and fall over time, but that opportunities alone are not sufficient to initiate a movement. Second, political process theorists recognize that actors' interpretation of social and political phenomena is crucial to movement emergence and movement participation. Third, the model recognizes that the actors' interpretations are dependent upon interactions with others. The focus is upon interactions among groups of people such as organizations. Fourth, the model argues that the process of cognitive liberation is more likely to occur in times of strong social integration as opposed to the assertion of earlier models, such as the mass society theory, which argued that collective behavior emerges in times of social disintegration (McAdam, 1988).

While political process theory provides a very useful explanation of movements as political actors who attach meaning to political phenomena, there are areas which lack clarity. For example, McAdam (1988) identifies "cognitive liberation" as a necessary component of movement emergence. However, it is unclear from what challengers are to be liberated. Borrowing from Smelser (1962), McAdam says that in order to achieve cognitive liberation actors must collectively define situations as unjust and subject to change through collective action. Then, in his contribution to movement theory, McAdam (1982) says that as actors make system attributions in an effort to define unjust situations, these actors are likely to initiate a movement. Again, this definition for cognitive liberation is a bit vague. Are movement actors to be liberated from a sense of personal responsibility (or the acceptance of personal responsibility) for unjust situations as in the Marxist concept of moving from false consciousness to class consciousness? Is cognitive liberation the political process equivalent of frame alignment (Snow, et al, 1986)? It is unclear.

Another issue to be resolved in the political process model is that of why actors collectively define an injustice. Proponents of the model, such as McAdam, argue that potential challengers interpret a given shift in political opportunities as favorable because they perceive that the shift decreases power disparity between challengers and the dominant group. This perceived shift is more important in explaining the movement than are the “internal characteristics of the movement organization and the social base upon which it drew,” according to Jenkins and Perrow (1997: 37). McAdam (1988: 49) also identifies these interpretations as the "crucial impetus to the process of cognitive liberation." Additionally, Gamson (2004) considers the relationship between the

construction of injustice frames and the media as it presents those constructions but also contribute to them. From this perspective, it seems that collective definition of injustice in the political process theory is somewhat like Davies' (1979) relative deprivation. As we will see in the analysis of the Sandinista National Liberation Front, this explanation explains well the last year of the Sandinista revolution when there was widespread popular insurrection. However, the Sandinista movement was formally founded and then maintained (of course, at varying degrees of strength) for over fifteen years before there was a widely perceived political shift that decreased power disparity. Therefore, it is unclear whether McAdam's cognitive liberation applies only to widespread insurgency or to any degree of movement activity. It would also be helpful if, in the discussion of injustice and system attributions, there were a clear linkage of these concepts to negation (Sjoberg, et al, 2003).

A third issue that requires more specific attention from political process theorists is the fact that movement emergence is mediated by the type and availability of communications technology as well as the availability of information to challengers. McAdam (1982) fully discusses the value of strong organizational and interpersonal networks to the emergence and maintenance of a social movement. However, the nature of communications is also an important variable in the evolution of a movement. For example, the availability of such things as reliable mail service, telephones, facsimile machines, telegraphs, computers, television, radio, video, printing presses and photocopiers greatly enhance a movement's ability to reach constituents and opponents. Availability of such technologies is dependent not only upon their physical presence but also on whether or not challengers have access to them. In the case of the Sandinistas,

many of these things were absent or few in number in a Third World country, but others were controlled by the dominant group against whom the Sandinistas led their movement. Nevertheless, the Sandinistas were eventually successful in toppling the group that controlled the technology. McAdam's model could easily incorporate issues of technology as well as discussion of the availability of information useful to the movement. Issues such as secrecy, volume of information, physical location of information, and bureaucratic controls on information all may either expedite or hinder movement activity.

Lastly, and most importantly for this study, the actors, challengers or movements in the political process explanation are ahistorical. As is the case with other theoretical models of social movements, McAdam's actors may or may not perceive their grievance as an historical problem and they do not perceive themselves as historical beings. Certainly, McAdam recognizes that the social movement exists in an historical context. He also discusses at length the idea that actors must perceive a problem and political opportunities. However, he does not allow that actors must make sense of their current personal and societal situation by reconstructing a past that provides an orderly explanation for it. Tarrow (1988: 435) suggests that scholars engage in comparative study of collective action cycles giving attention to "the macrohistorical pace of change between cycles and the rapid spread of new forms of collective action within them," but that interest in history is, again, the researcher's idea of history rather than the participants' view.

Noonan (1997) argues that political opportunity models usually fail to consider cultural opportunities. The construction of cultural concepts such as heroes, villains, and

history are then unexplained and unexplored. Young (2002: 666) draws attention to the utility of extensive and intensive cultural schemas in explaining how participants "make sense of bewildering circumstances" and "provide coherent meaings and motivations." Certainly, there is plenty of room for these meanings to be rooted in history as Young's study of confessional protest may include participants reconstructing a sinful past. Actors must attach meaning to their situation, as McAdam says, but I argue, the meaning has to be historical. The historical meaning constructed by actors subsumes cognitive liberation, ideology, selection of tactics, and proposed solutions.

McAdam (1994) does begin to explore the cultural roots of movements as well as the emergence and development of a movement culture. Later, political process theorists undertook the task of synthesizing "political opportunities, mobilizing structures and framing processes" (McAdam, et al, 1996: 2). Within this discussion is some attention to how "the flow of history" can expose cultural contradictions that then inspire mobilization (Zald, 1996: 268). Additionally there is consideration of the role of media in the framing process. However, the discussion of media assumes a certain level of available technology and then how tightly or loosely it is controlled. Thus political process theorists turn in the direction of solving the problems of more clearly defining and incorporating into their model the participants' view of the world mediated by how that view is communicated through media. Nevertheless, while the political process model moves toward addressing movement participants' understanding of their past, these theorists do not actually consider it and certainly do not consider it as crucial to movement building and success.

In a surprising turn of events, McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly (2001: 18) admit that the political process model is "overly structural and static," that it is limited to focusing on a single actor, and that it "serves poorly" as an explanation for non-Western polities. They then argue in favor of more emphasis on dynamic analysis and extending the idea of framing beyond its use by movement leaders to include use by members, opponents, media and others. Most importantly, they say, they will "place social construction at the center of our analysis" (McAdam, Tarrow & Tilly, 2001: 51). The authors even use Nicaragua as an example of one of their points.

It is very good news that the political process theorists recognize the model's over emphasis on structural analysis and that the model must give more attention to dynamic social construction. It is also encouraging that McAdam and his colleagues realize that the model is much less useful in non-Western societies. I have already argued variations of these points to some degree. However, the model still does not account for participants reconstructing a past and employing it to drive their movement. The authors do mention time. First, they mention that the origin of a social movement is a "temporally limited concept" and therefore, they propose viewing mobilization as a series of episodes (McAdam, Tarrow & Tilly, 2001: 50). Later, they note that the historical and cultural details of an episode influence movement dynamics. However, in both comments about time, they are speaking of it as something that the researcher understands and not something the movement participants construct.

The Reconstruction of the Past and Posthumous Charisma

In order to explain the Sandinista National Liberation Front as a social movement, sociologists must explain the role of the history of Nicaragua. However, we

do not need yet another book on the role of the Sandinistas in Nicaraguan history as determined by social scientists. Instead, the understanding of Nicaraguan history by the Sandinistas is crucial to a proper explanation of movement processes. While this study focuses on the case of the FSLN, reconstruction of the past by movement participants is a necessary element in any movement. As stated previously, none of the current movement theories adequately addresses the reconstruction of the past as necessary to movement emergence and maintenance. Therefore, we must look outside movement literature for theoretical support in understanding this phenomenon.

Mead's Reconstruction of the Past

The reconstruction of the past as a sociological phenomenon is a well developed theoretical theme in the work of George Herbert Mead (1932; 1934; 1936; 1938; 1964). Mead (1932: 1) proposes in the first sentence of his principle work regarding time - The Philosophy of the Present - that "reality exists in a present." Past and future can only be conceptualized in terms of the present. In Mead's view, the natures of the past and future are extensions of the present. Mead (1964: 348) states, "The past is an overflow of the present. It is oriented from the present." Therefore, the nature of the present is critical to an understanding of the past and its function.

The present consists of emergent events that are unique and that serve to order the passage of time. The present, constituted by events or moments, is marked then by its own emergence and disappearance. The past appears as we identify the conditions that preceded the present and thus become "engaged in spreading backward what is going on so that the steps we are taking will be a continuity in the advance to the goals of our conduct" (Mead, 1964: 347).

The emergent event is that which is novel or unpredicted. Emergent events may be scientific discoveries, as Mead discusses, or accidents, tragedies, or triumphs among other things. The importance of emergent events lies in the fact that they are exceptions to standard interpretative categories. These exceptions require a change in those categories so that the exception is explained, is the culmination of a temporal order, reflects continuity of process, and becomes rational. Hence, the emergent requires a past.

Mead is not saying that the reconstructed past is pure fantasy. Even though the emergent calls for a new past, that new past must rest upon some form of evidence. In other words, evidence allows us to know that something happened. However, just as reflection belongs to the present, so does knowledge. This knowledge and the accompanying truth about what happened will be reconstructed "from the standpoint of [their] own emergent nature[s]" (Mead, 1932: 31). It is the meaning of the something that occurred in the past and its relation to the emergent that is given to interpretation and re-interpretation. It is in this sense that "there is...the past which is expressed in irrevocability, though there has never been present in experience a past which has not changed with the passing generations. The pasts that we are involved in are both irrevocable and revocable" (Mead, 1932: 2).

The search for meaning is the critical element in the reconstruction of the past as it is in all facets of social life. Mead (1938: 515) asserts:

> Metaphysically, things are their meanings, and the forms they take on are the outcome of interactions which are responsible for the appearance of new forms, i.e., new meanings. In a single phrase, the world is ceaselessly becoming what it means. This is true in thinking because thought is simply the communication to ourselves or others of what is.

The new past provides causal explanations for the emergent and is useful in making predictions about the future. Therefore, the emergent has meaning with reference to a meaningful past.

In addition to providing causal explanations for the emergent, time becomes psychologically and socially manageable as the reconstruction imposes temporal order. While Mead does not necessarily believe that time is linear, he suggests that we find some comfort in conceptualizing it as ordered in a linear fashion. Such a temporal order also implies continuity. One emergent event blends into another instead of occupying discrete positions in time. In this sense, the past does, to some degree, shape the present. Nevertheless, Mead's central thesis remains that the past is reconstructed in order to explain the current unpredicted problem.

Mead's theory of time is useful in the explanation of social movements as will be explained in the following pages. However, Mead's explanation is limited in that it does not address power. The reconstruction of any past is highly dependent on the power relationships in a society. In order to explain any given emergent event, actors must have access to information regarding the current emergent event and information about events that preceded the emergent. Access to such information is often subject to the control of the dominant group. In addition, any dissemination of a reconstructed past by actors outside the dominant group is subject to the control of the dominant group. Therefore, while Mead's reconstruction of the past is crucial to a theory of social movements, such a theory must address counterpasts constructed by movements existing in and attempting to manipulate power relationships.

Mead's theory of time has received minimal attention in philosophical literature and has been largely ignored in sociological and anthropological writings with only a few

exceptions (Tonness, 1932; Fen, 1951; Natanson, 1953; Lee, 1963; Miller, 1973; Joas, 1980; Cronk, 1987; Katovich, 1992). There has been only one attempt to link Mead's ideas to the study of social movements (Maines, Sugrue, and Katovich, 1983). Maines, Sugrue, and Katovitch (1983) identify four dimensions of the past in Mead's theory of time. The "symbolically reconstructed past," the "social structural past," and the "implied objective past" constitute the dimensions in which people find meaning in the present through attaching meaning to the past. Fourth, there is a "mythical past." The authors call these mythical pasts "creations rather than re-creations, because they are not empirically grounded. They are fictitious" (Maine, et al, 1983: 164). The mythical past is created solely for purposes of manipulating behavior in social situations so that the creator might acquire or maintain a power advantage. They argue that this type of past is especially useful to social movements as they must discredit or destroy the official past of the power structure and replace it with their own past thereby legitimizing the movement's purpose. These authors' concept of the mythical past is problematic and will be addressed later in this chapter.

Historian Thomas Benjamin (2000) has recently addressed the role of collective memory and mythmaking in the institutionalized Mexican Revolution. His focus, though, is on how Mexican writers, intellectuals, journalists and politicians presented the revolution in its immediate aftermath. He mentions that this “remembering” involves “the reconstruction of the past in the light of the present” (Benjamin, 2000: 20). However, he does not ground his comment Mead’s theory nor even cite Mead. He does

mention in passing that versions of memory that resist the official memory of the Revolution constitute counter-memory in Foucault's sense of the term.[8]

Benjamin's work provides a fascinating picture of how image is constructed and presented thus creating *La Revolución* (as he calls the collective memory version of the Revolution) as a dominant memory. The ideas are useful in that they highlight the ramifications of evolving and ever-changing memories and histories. However, he is not discussing how counter-memory was used by revolutionaries before victory or how participants' understanding of their own historical place affects social movements. In some sense then, even this work is discussing how actors place the social movement in history after the fact, just as social scientists do. This study of the Sandinista revolution is interested in how the Sandinistas understood their place in history while they were making revolution and how that understanding drove their movement.

Recently, there has been growing attention given to the roles of narrative and emotions in social movements. Polletta (1998: 139) argues that the construction of a narrative within a social movement has "a temporally configurative capacity" that "equips it to integrate past, present, and future events..." She further argues that narrative is not the same as a frame because, unlike frames, it is constructed over time, keeps actors engaged as movement participants or potential participants as it requires "interpretive participation," and narrative recognizes that there are constraints on which narrative plots

[8] Foucault's discussion of counter-memory is a discussion of the nature of the recovery of history. "Traditional history" is generally considered 'true' yet "effective history" is abrupt, unexpected and perhaps, unwieldy, not following a linear path and not conforming to historians' categories. For a detailed discussion of Foucault's idea of history and memory, see Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews, 1977.

will resonate given "dominant cultural understandings" (Polletta, 1998: 142). Polletta (1998: 142) also mentions that "oppositional meanings must always contend with more conventional ones."

While Polletta's analysis leaves much room for the reconstruction of the past by movement participants, she has yet to incorporate it in her analysis. Davis (2002: 12) mentions that stories "configure the past in light of the present and future." However, when delving into the meaning of that statement, these movement theorists are generally not addressing the reconstruction of a full history by participants of how history brought them to this point. For example, Polletta's (2002) study of lunch counter sit-ins in the South focuses on how the civil rights activists told the story of the sit-ins themselves and does not address the civil rights movement's reconstruction of a history that explained white domination and race discrimination. In this way, her analysis is quite similar to Benjamin's analysis of the Mexican Revolution. Her argument also seems to distinguish between stories or narratives, which is the focus of her analysis, and arguments based on actual evidence. She does briefly mention the relationship of construction of a narrative to power but only says that the social movement narrative must contend with other narrative. However, she is generally discussing the idea that narratives are created within dominant cultural patterns and are, therefore, themselves subject to those patterns. Mention of George Herbert Mead in the analysis of narrative is extremely rare and then only the most brief mention is made to establish a theoretical connection between understanding at the individual and communal levels (Rice, 2002: 79). Unfortunately, movement theorists have not yet employed Mead's theory of time to more deeply analyze narrative and to establish narrative as part of the reconstruction of history process.

Weber and Charisma

Unlike Mead's reconstruction of the past, Weber's concept of charisma is very familiar to sociologists. However, the possibility of posthumous charisma has been mentioned, under other names, by only a handful of scholars. Therefore, it is an area of theoretical and empirical interest ripe for exploration and discussion. Following is an outline of Weber's idea of charisma and, interestingly, Weber does not preclude a leader's charisma surviving beyond the leader's physical life.

In The Sociology of Religion, Weber (1922) presents his concept of charisma. Weber (1922: 2) classifies charisma as either " a gift that inheres in an object or person simply by virtue of natural endowment" or that which is "produced artificially in an object or person though some extraordinary means." He also notes that charisma may be either a permanent or occasional condition. Weber begins to establish the most important aspect of charisma - that it is socially constructed and not simply a personal quality.

Weber (1947: 358) begins to explain that charisma is a social construction in The Theory of Social and Economic Organization when he describes the charismatic individual as "set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities." The charismatic individual then becomes a leader when he gains followers who grant him/her leadership status by virtue of his/her charisma. It is in this context that charisma and leadership become linked for Weber.

Weber (1958: 245) expands on this idea of charismatic leadership by explaining that charismatic leaders are unique and rise to leadership in unique times:

> ...the 'natural' charismatic leaders - in times of psychic, physical, economic, ethical, religious, political distress - have been neither officeholders nor incumbents of an 'occupation' in the present sense of the word, that is men who have acquired expert knowledge and who serve for remuneration. The natural leaders in distress have been holders of specific gifts of the body and spirit; and these gifts have been believed to be supernatural, not accessible to everybody.

Therefore, charismatic leaders answer a call to remedy widespread distress, and they originate from outside the institutionalized system of the status quo.

There are several other important aspects of charisma. First, Weber's use of the term charisma is value-neutral, meaning that charismatic leaders may or may not be admirable characters. Second, the charismatic individual immerses himself/herself in his/her mission and perceives that those persons to whom he/she directs the mission are bound by duty to recognize the leader's charisma. Third, charisma does not seek "pecuniary gain that is methodical and rational," and it "is never a source of private gain for its holders in the sense of economic exploitation by the making of a deal" (Weber, 1958: 247). Fourth, the charismatic leader does not subscribe to abstract legal codes. The charismatic leader provides necessary direction and is the one to settle disputes (Weber, 1968: 24). Lastly, because charisma arises in times of distress and depends upon the performance of miracles, it is extremely unstable. As charismatic authority is granted through the recognition of it by followers and their devotion to it, any perception of failure of the charismatic leader by the followers diminishes that authority (Weber, 1968: 22). However, until that time, the charismatic leader's authority is freely accepted by the followers who consider the leader to be their master. They do not enjoy monetary gain for their devotion, and it is not a devotion born of fear. The devotion springs from love and enthusiasm for the leader and his/her cause.

Weber (1947: 364) next addresses the problem of status of a movement after the disappearance of its charismatic leader. He notes that charismatic authority is opposed to bureaucratic structures. Yet, if the disciples are to form a stable and continuous community, they must organize themselves. At this point, charismatic authority becomes rationalized or traditionalized. The followers may meet the problems of continuity and succession in one of several ways:

> 1. The search for a new charismatic leader on the basis of criteria of the qualities that will fit him for the position of authority.
>
> 2. By revelation manifested in oracles, lots, divine judgments, or other techniques of selection.
>
> 3. By the designation on the part of the original charismatic leader of his own successor and his recognition on the part of the followers.
>
> 4. Designation of a successor by the charismatically qualified administrative staff and his recognition by the community.
>
> 5. By the conception that charisma is a quality transmitted by heredity: thus that it is participated in by the kinsmen of its bearer, particularly by his closest relatives.
>
> 6. The concept that charisma may be transmitted by ritual means from one bear to another or may be created in a new person.
> (Weber, 1947: 364-366)

Numerous social scientists have discussed and elaborated Weber's list of characteristics of the charismatic leader (Tucker, 1968; Roth, 1975; Shils, 1975; Wallis & Bruce, 1986; Lindholm, 1990). While using different terms, these scholars agree that the essence of the charismatic leader is a person who is thoroughly committed to his/her vision and mission and who can effectively communicate that vision using personal magnetism and miraculous performance as well as empowering others to achieve the vi-

sion.[9] Conger (1989: 29) argues that the charismatic leader has a unique sensitivity to the constituents' needs, is able to articulate an "extraordinary vision rather than ordinary goals," is able to build trust in his/her vision among constituents and then convince followers that they can achieve the vision. Most importantly, these must "be seen by followers as relevant to their situation" (Conger, 1989: 23).

In addition to discussing charismatic characteristics, social scientists discuss the followers' response. Apter (1968) and Tucker (1968: 736) agree that while a follower would not consider contradicting the charismatic leader or question the leader's infallibility, absolute obedience to the leader is not necessary but rather that the leader "exercises a kind of 'domination' over the followers" by virtue of his/her extraordinary qualities. However, Willner (1984) and Katz (1972) argue that the followers see the leader as omnipotent. According to Smelser (1963: 356), followers wish for a return to certain values. Apter (1968) finds charisma to be especially appealing in the Third World as an increase in modernity is not met by a proportionate decrease in traditionalism thus leaving a vacuum and confusion. Both Apter (1968) and Willner (1984) view the role of charisma as important to the growth or independence of a nation and in promoting a sense of national unity. Apter and Willner also agree that charisma inspires political activism leading to social change, especially a change toward greater social equality. Kimmel (1989: 506) argues that "charisma is both a consequence and cause of a revolutionary situation."

[9] Millenarianism is another way of understanding Sandino's leadership. For examination of Sandino as millenarian, see Marco Aurelio Navarro-Genie, 2002. Also see a study of millenarianism in revolution in James F. Rinehart, 1997.

Though some scholarly attention is given to followers of the charismatic leader, other scholars point out that followers have been woefully neglected while the study of leaders is rather extensive (Madsen & Snow, 1991; Platt & Lilley, 1994). This emphasis on the leader may be somewhat understandable since charisma "is an influence relationship marked by asymmetry...Asymmetry means that the leader has profound influence on attitudes and behavior of the following but that the opposite is not true" (Madsen & Snow, 1991: 5). True enough, but charisma is a relationship, and charisma in the Weberian sense exists only as it is recognized and granted by followers. Furthermore, Platt and Lilley (1994) are concerned that scholars treat followers as a homogeneous group who are unquestioning, dutiful, docile, and adoring with regard to the leader. Instead, Platt and Lilley argue that followers are not at all homogeneous in motive or interests but submit to coordination and cooperation to achieve movement goals or the charismatic vision. Charismatic leaders assist in this process by narrowing focus, giving hope, defining interests and providing rhetoric and courses of action (Platt & Lilley, 1994).

While work on charismatic leadership does not directly consider the leader's understanding of history and his/her place in it, there is a place for such consideration as the work does not preclude it either. As the leader articulates the problem to followers and then articulates the vision or mission that will remedy the problem, there is a clear opportunity for theory to allow for and analyze the leader's injection of historical understanding into those projects. Furthermore, interaction between leader and followers is likely to demand historical

explanation because followers must be able to explain why they are involved by citing an ongoing problem or a problem that has gone before. Then as the leader articulates the remedy, followers accept it as an historical answer to the historical problem. Even though a charismatic leader dies or leaves, his or her work or movement may continue. Tucker (1968) writes that with the passing of a charismatic leader, charisma is not routinized but transformed into another type of authority. However, Tucker also allows that charisma does not necessarily die with the leader. "On the contrary, it appears to be a phenomenon that can and often does live on after the individual is gone," argues Tucker (1968: 754). Willner (1984: 199) names this phenomenon "the charismatic myth." Willner also writes that the charismatic myth can be extraordinarily resilient even when successors try to destroy it.

The Immortality of Leaders

The idea that charisma may live on after the charismatic leader's death is particularly relevant to some social movements. However, only a few scholars have considered the topic empirically, in sociological literature generally and social movement literature specifically (Anderson, 1982; Tumarkin 1983). Robert Jay Lifton (1967: 69), based on his studies of Mao Tse Tung, conceptualizes "revolutionary immortality" as "a shared sense of participating in permanent revolutionary foment, and of transcending individual death by 'living on' indefinitely within this continuing revolution." Lifton (1967) also believes that people have a need for a sense of immortality in order to feel a

connection to the past and future. Within this "symbolic immortality," the revolutionary "becomes a part of a vast 'family' reaching back to what he perceives to be the beginnings of his revolution and extending infinitely into the future" (Lifton, 1967: 70). Lifton (1967: 97) links revolution to death symbolism and writes that revolutionaries see their activities as a means to transcend death by "achieving an eternal historical imprint." In Revolutionary Immortality, Lifton (1968: 31) continues that the response of activists or revolutionaries to the thought of death is "a quest for rebirth." Berger (1969) suggests that immortality or rebirth occurs within the group or the followers. “The individual's innermost being is considered to be the fact of his belonging to the collectivity...This identification of the individual with all others with whom he interacts makes for a merging of his being with theirs...” (Berger, 1969: 60).

In summary, charisma is not a personal quality, but a relationship between a leader and his/her followers. This relationship is likely to arise in times of distress thereby sometimes resulting in revolution. The followers perceive the leader as uniquely qualified to handle their distress - lead their revolution. The impact of charisma may be sweeping and lasting social change. Not only may the impact of charisma remain for many years but the charisma itself may outlive the charismatic individual and/or be used by successors to renew or continue a social movement.

A New Direction

Mead and Weber present useful ideas for explaining specific aspects of social movements. Mead believes that we reconstruct the past in light of present emergent events. Therefore, reconstruction is a continuous process as one present melts into another. Reconstruction provides meaning and continuity for the present as well as a

sense of order. In addition, some sort of evidence always supports the reconstructed past, thus giving the past a certain legitimacy. This legitimate past may serve to gain or maintain a power advantage. Hence, it would be useful to both the institutionalized powers and those seeking power.

Weber's conception of charisma is decidedly applicable to many leaders who work to bring social change. A combination of Weber's idea and Mead's idea of the past yields the possibility of reconstructing a past leader and attributing to him or her posthumous charisma for the purpose of providing meaning and continuity to a contemporary social movement. In this case, the social movement is the Sandinista National Liberation Front, and the charismatic leader is Augusto César Sandino.

Theory of the Counterpast

It is a given among many social movement theorists that conditions that could be understood as structural strain are a constant in society (McCarthy & Zald, 1977; McAdam, 1982). As individuals and groups experience this structural strain, they may identify it and construct a problem or grievance. These actors may understand the grievance as the responsibility or fault of individuals such as the actor him/herself, a political leader, an employer or a criminal and may understand it as affecting an individual or individuals. In this case, the actor may be suffering from false consciousness or an analogous phenomenon (Marx, 1986). If the actor does fault individuals for the grievance, then the grievance does not inspire collective reconstruction of the past nor collective action.

An alternative scenario to the previous one is that actors may understand the problem or grievance as a problem negatively affecting a well-defined group to which

they may or may not belong. They may also believe that the grievance is caused or perpetrated by specific forces external to the group whether these external forces be individuals, organizations, institutions, or the social structure itself. Therefore, the actors perceive a struggle between the negatively affected group and the identifiable, external causal entity over the stake of whatever the grievance may be (Touraine, 1981). As actors collectively construct the grievance and identify the oppressed and mistreated group, they engage in system attributions (McAdam, 1982), and they adopt and spread generalized beliefs to explain their situation (Smelser, 1962). At this point, social movement theorists argue that individuals are ready to act collectively to bring about social change in their favor.

The abovementioned theoretical argument is reasonable but is limited by its ahistorical nature. In all social movements, the definition of the problem or grievance and identification of the aggrieved group occur in the present. Proponents of current and previous social movement theories do not consider that the actors view their problem as an historical problem nor do they allow that the actors understand themselves as part of a historical process. The theorists may set the aggrieved group in historical context but do not allow the actors to have personal or collective perceptions of their autobiographies nor of the history of their situation or society. Therefore, the definition of the problem and the identification of the aggrieved group must be set in historical context, not only by social movement theorists such as Marx (1986), Gamson, et al (1982), Skocpol (1979), Tilly (1978), and McAdam (1982), but by the social movement participants and potential participants. The grievance and the actors' relationship to the grievance must have historical meaning for the actors in order for them to act collectively. In other words, the

aggrieved will reconstruct a past that makes sense of the grievance and that makes sense of the actors' potential and actual collective response to the grievance.

Of the social movement theories reviewed in this chapter, frame analysis and the political process model do provide some useful tools in moving toward reconstructing the past. Framing's emphasis on considering the meaning that social movement actors attach to their participation and consideration of emergent meanings is certainly a part of reconstructing the past. In addition, framing contributes an explanation for grievance interpretation in micromobilization. Political process theory also gives attention to subjective meaning derived from social interaction. Yet this model also considers what it calls system attribution thus giving consideration to some structural factors. However, in spite of these strengths with regard to the focus of this study, these models do not answer the questions posed here.

In order to understand why and how social movement participants reconstruct a past for themselves and their movement, I propose a theory of the counterpast. Included in this understanding of movements is a focus on subjective meaning rooted in interaction, emergent meaning and system attributions of a sort. However, Mead's theory of time, coupled with Touraine's concept of power as it relates to the production of knowledge, provides explanation for construction of meaning and system attribution that goes beyond existing movement theory. Current movement theory regarding narrative informs the reconstruction of the past but is subsumed by the theory of the counterpast.

Actors collectively reconstruct the past in order to explain an emergent event and to give meaning to the event and to their own behavior. An integration of Mead's ideas into an explanation of social movements requires that movements reconstruct a past to

explain their identification of a grievance and adoption of an "injustice frame" (Gamson, et al 1982) and that reconstruction occurs within a particular societal power structure. Therefore, the counterpast is a history constructed by social movement participants that explains and elaborates the antecedents of the participants' particular grievance and that stands in opposition to the official, consensual history put forth by the dominant group in the society. The counterpast is supported by historical evidence that counters the historical evidence that justifies existing power arrangements. This evidence is not necessarily objective fact with which many will agree, but it is evidence that will satisfy whatever the criteria are for reconstructing a particular history.[10] Included within the construction of a counterpast are likely to be various narratives and negations.

The reconstruction of the past by movement participants serves several purposes. First, the counterpast clarifies and elaborates the original grievance. As the reconstructed past becomes more detailed and complex, the grievance is brought into sharper focus, and other grievances may be added. In this sense, grievances are dynamic. Within the reconstruction of their past and identification of the grievance, participants will exercise negation of some other group or entity that they perceive to be at odds with them.

Second, the reconstructed past provides the movement with a sense of historical continuity and temporal order. Movement participants know that their grievance is part of a continuous, historical process as is their struggle against the cause of the grievance. Their oppression and struggle also become part of a process that occurs in an identifiable,

[10] As stated previously, the reconstructed past is not a set of lies nor outright manipulation of the truth for self-interest. However, the evidence to support that past may include errors, may be selective, and may be subject to re-interpretation later. None of these issues changes the idea that the way in which actors construct history is relevant to the development of social movements.

chronological order - perhaps in stages. While this counterpast is disagreeable to movement participants, it provides a certain level of control to participants because they may feel that they now have an overview of the problem and can begin to solve it through collective action.

Third, the reconstruction of the past provides the movement with an ideology. As movement participants construct the counterpast, an ideology evolves that explains their current predicament in value-laden terms. Therefore, the counterpast not only uses evidence to outline an event-by-event chronology, but also explains why events happened as they did and whether events and their causes or purposes were good or bad according to movement definitions. Additionally, included in this reconstructed past will be "accounts" that justify movement behavior as having positive value in spite of opponents claiming movement behavior is illegitimate (Scott & Lyman, 1968). Furthermore, the counterpast allows participants to engage in "critically evaluating or negating what is and then use their critique to push forward their alternative suggestion" (Sjoberg, et al, 2003: 218).

Fourth, the reconstructed past allows the movement to project a future. As the movement outlines the history that led to the current situation, it also prescribes an historical remedy. Movement participants present, at least, two possible futures based on their reconstruction of the past. The first possible future consists of continued oppression of the aggrieved group through means such as enslavement, co-optation, threats, or socialization, and, possibly, eventual annihilation of the group. The second possible future is that the aggrieved group and its allies will act collectively and force power relationships to change in their favor. The change may involve limited change in these

power relationships such as in the case of reform, or it may involve extensive change as is the case in revolution.

With the reconstruction of a past that explains how the grievance came to be and why the collectivity is responding in the way that it is, the movement enters into a struggle over the control of socio-cultural patterns (Touraine, 1971; 1977; 1988). The socio-cultural patterns of concern here particularly involve the production of knowledge about the history of a given subject and the dissemination of knowledge and information about that subject. Movement actors struggle with the dominant group over the control of the production of history and the spread of knowledge about history because movement actors have reconstructed a history that is counter to previously known or widespread histories.

The production of history and the dissemination of knowledge about history generally occur in and through organizations, and the largest and most powerful of these organizations are likely to be controlled by the dominant class. In contemporary societies, knowledge is often produced within large, powerful organizations. In any given society, knowledge is a product and the controllers of this product constitute the dominant class (Touraine, 1977). Each new bit of knowledge that is produced requires reconstructions of history to explain the place of the new information in human experience (Mead, 1959). As knowledge is produced within organizations such as governmental agencies, universities, or corporations, these organizations retain significant control of the dissemination and meaning of that knowledge/information. Therefore, as universities produce historical research or government agencies produce reports of the history of some event, leaders of these organizations produce policy that

determines which information is made public and when announcements are made or not made. Therefore, they have significant power over which bits of knowledge become part of a society's consensual history and over the historical meaning of the knowledge. For example, until the advent of the contemporary women's movement and women's studies programs, the role of women in US history was generally either not a topic of research or researchers limited study to women's roles as wives and mothers of great men. Therefore, the consensual history of the United States has emphasized the history of men in politics, business, religion, and the military. Only recently has there been a widespread effort within the academy to reconstruct US history with both women and men playing pivotal roles (Bart, 1971; Degler, 1975; Lerner, 1976; Scott 1986).

Through interaction with individuals and with the social structure, movement participants and potential participants reconstruct the past in such a way that their "past" challenges the "official," consensual history and provides meaning for their movement. In other words, the movement's reconstructed past stands in opposition to an "official" past. The official past is a consensual history understood, at a societal level, as the relatively accurate and complete account of how and why any given social phenomenon came to be as it is. Furthermore, this official past is largely constructed by and will serve the interests of the society's dominant group or groups in terms of the growth and/or maintenance of the dominant group's power. The dominant group has the power to maintain their version of history through control of the production of knowledge and distribution of information. Control of the production of knowledge includes general and specific control of research agenda, school curricula, and media thereby managing the ideological socialization of society's members in order to legitimize the socio-cultural

system and the dominant group's place in that system (Habermas, 1973; Touraine, 1977). For example, school history texts in this largely Christian nation have often discussed the role of Christian belief in the building of the United States but have not routinely and broadly discussed or even mentioned the role of specific minority religious beliefs.

Given that the dominant group has wide-ranging control of the production of consensual history, it is necessary for the aggrieved group to reconstruct this consensual history in order to demonstrate the historical injustice of the grievance. The aggrieved group or challengers (Gamson, et al 1982) will view the problem as historical, but they must also view themselves (at the movement level) as historical beings in the context of the historical problem. The movement is then an historical answer to the historical problem. For instance, a collectivity defined the custom of African-Americans sitting in the back of buses or standing while white persons got the best seats as an unjust situation. The adoption of such a grievance requires an explanation for how the situation came about and why the situation is unjust. As challengers, the African-American's historical explanation will contradict the explanation offered by the dominant white group and will serve to delegitimize the existing socio-cultural system and its power structures. While many whites explained these types of customs as "natural" results of white persons' biological, mental, and spiritual superiority, African-Americans reconstructed a history that cited slavery and its legacy as the historical problem feeding institutional racism, which served to maintain the dominance of white Americans at the expense of black Americans.

The reconstruction of the past by movements is mediated by the ability of movements to learn of and communicate the past. The counterpast is based, as is the

official version of the past, on facts regarding historical events. Such facts must first be available to the movements through personal testimony, books, documents, newspapers, or other forms, in order for them to reconstruct a past. While the facts used to reconstruct the past, whether by the movement or by the dominant group, may be selective, they are not necessarily mythical as is argued by Maines and his colleagues (Maines, et al, 1983). Certainly, movement actors and elites may create "facts" to support their position, but I argue that the reconstruction of the past for movements is largely based on verifiable facts that are comprised of new information or are linked together and/or interpreted in a new way. Movements must then be able to communicate that reconstructed past to an audience of potential supporters as well as to the oppressor.

The ability of the social movement to reconstruct a counterpast is dependent upon the level and type of social control exercised by the dominant groups. In other words, if the social movement can find no "facts" with which to reconstruct a factual counterpast, then movement activity will be stillborn, severely hampered or halted. No matter which facts become available, the movement's reconstructed past will, as is also the case with the dominant group's official past, support its own contentions. In addition, public and private discourse about competing histories will continually shape and reshape movement and official versions of the past. In essence, the past is dynamic. In Meadian terms, the present is continually spread backward as new emergent events occur.

In summary, no matter what a movement's particular grievance, the movement must reconstruct a history that opposes the official version of history in order to clearly separate itself from the dominant group and, therefore, legitimate collective action as a proper means to address the grievance. If a group were to agree with official history or to

generally agree with it, then that group would not initiate collective action. At best, the group may become a special interest group using conventional means of achieving its interests. For example, the Republican and Democratic parties (non-movement political groups) will generally subscribe to official versions of US history, but at any given moment will push for reform of one type or another through the conventional legislative processes. On the other hand, members of the American Indian Movement (a movement organization) will cite the continuing oppression, cultural domination, and genocide of American Indians by European Americans and the US government in direct contrast to the official history in school textbooks of white settlers pioneering the American wilderness and bringing civilization and progress to this nation. In any case, it is crucial to understand that the reconstruction of the past and past figures is more than simply a difference of opinion on what or who should be included or not in history texts. Movements understand the history of their country, group, or situation in a fundamentally different way from official, consensual understanding. Therefore, movement understanding of history and historical figures, given the purpose of social movements in general, will be at odds with the dominant group's understanding.

Posthumous Charisma

Within the process of reconstructing a past, movement actors may reconstruct individual histories or biographies as important components of the larger history. In the history reconstructed by movements, the meaning of figures from the past will likely differ from their meaning in consensual history. For example, a revered business leader in consensual history may be reinterpreted by movement actors as a profit-mongering murderer because he or she approved development and sale of environmental toxins.

Alternatively, a relatively nondescript figure in consensual history may become a folk hero in movement history.

The reconstruction of charisma and charismatic leaders is certainly possible within a movement context. This study only addresses the reconstruction of a charismatic leader who was charismatic when he was living. Therefore, it is unclear whether a person who was not considered charismatic when living can then be imbued with posthumous charisma. Nevertheless, the following paragraphs outline posthumous charisma as an important, but not necessarily required, component of a movement's reconstruction of history. Posthumous charisma is similar to charisma in that it is a relationship between a leader and followers that is characterized by 1) a belief that the leader is exceptional, even divine; 2) fairly thorough submission to the leader's authority (but not blind obedience); 3) followers' deep commitment to the leader's original mission; and 4) a sense of emotional commitment of the followers toward the leader. The followers do likely understand that the leader is dead, but treat the leader's personal characteristics and mission as relevant to the current situation. Posthumous charisma differs from charisma in that the leader, obviously, cannot participate in any emotional relationship with followers. Furthermore, the posthumous charismatic leader will only arise in situations of distress similar to the original distress and the leader's posthumous charisma will be dependent on a living person(s) to communicate his/her message.

The leader who has posthumous charisma is endowed with many of the same qualities as the living charismatic leader. However, it is obvious that these qualities and the relationship with followers cannot be exactly the same as if the leader were alive. For example, the leader cannot be actively and personally involved with followers or with the

movement. Nevertheless, followers will reconstruct the historical leader with charismatic features. First, the deceased leader will still personify or symbolize certain values important to followers and will symbolize opposition to the status quo. The leader has special gifts that are not accessible to most people. He/she is still trustworthy and is the object of the followers' devotion. As is the case with the living charismatic leader, the leader with posthumous charisma remains the champion of an important and viable mission or vision.

Followers are most likely to reconstruct this historical figure during times of widespread distress because they believe the leader to have solutions to the distress. The followers see the leader as one who sacrificed and sacrifices for the cause or mission that they pursue. In fact, the followers may indeed believe that the death of the leader was the leader's ultimate sacrifice. The deceased leader and his/her sacrifice may symbolize the righteousness of the cause and movement actions (Kearl & Rinaldi, 1983; Cobb & Elder, 1972). Lastly, because the followers believe that the leader has all these characteristics, the leader who is posthumously charismatic seems to have a type of authority over the followers. Obviously, the quality of the authority is not that of a living leader, but the followers will invoke the leader's words and example as being authoritative in terms of directing their lives and that of the movement. His/her words and example may even dominate their lives as is the case in deceased religious charismatic leaders. In the case of political charismatic leaders, followers may form a political religion around the leader (Anderson, 1982; Tumarkin, 1983). In any event, the followers are likely to understand that the leader is dead.

The passing of a charismatic leader may not necessarily bring attributions of posthumous charisma. Instead, the death of the leader may bring the weakening or disappearance of the movement. The death may accompany the victory or success of the movement in terms of reaching its goals. The leader's passing may also signal the institutionalization of the movement.

If the leader's charisma is reconstructed posthumously by followers, at least two factors are required. First, movement participants must perceive some type of widespread distress. Further, participants must perceive this distress as being the same or very similar to the distress to which the charismatic leader responded during his/her life. The leader held the solutions once and still has the wisdom and knowledge to remedy the distress again but, this time, through hands other than his/her own. In addition, there must be a living person or persons who communicate the leader's vision and maintain the communication. Of course, these persons' ability to communicate the leader's qualities and vision is subject to the availability of information about the leader and his/her personality, words and actions.

In summary, charisma and posthumous charisma cannot be the same social phenomenon. The interactions between a living leader and living followers cannot equal qualitatively the "relationship" between a deceased leader and living followers. Nevertheless, the two phenomena are extremely similar as followers attribute most of the same qualities to posthumously charismatic and charismatic leaders.

In spite of the qualitative difference, participants in some movements may reconstruct a deceased charismatic leader as part of an overall reconstruction of the past that must occur in movements. Because the leader's charisma is being reconstructed as

part of a more general reconstruction of history to make sense of an emergent event, only those qualities, words, and examples of the leader that contribute to an explanation for and answer to the present situation will be featured in the reconstructed leader. Again, while the facts used in the reconstruction of this historical figure are selective, the posthumously charismatic leader and the followers' reconstruction of him/her is not necessarily a web of lies nor an effort at conscious manipulation of movement participants or the public.

Conclusion

Social movement participants are actors who are aware of their grievance as an historical problem. The problem may have a very brief history in participants' minds or it may be centuries old. As a group, they will reconstruct a past that counters the past put forth by the dominant group (as it relates to the aggrieved group) as the generally accepted history of the group, situation, or condition. Any group that views the past in accordance with the dominant consensual history will not become a social movement because it will not believe there is a need for social change. A social movement must reconstruct the past in such a way as to provide for itself meaning, a sense of continuity and order, an ideology and a sense of a future. Included in this reconstruction may be the reconstruction of an individual biography as one means of providing the qualities mentioned above. Though perhaps not necessary to movement success, the reconstruction of a "hero" and the construction of posthumous charisma in this movement figure provides an interesting case study of the phenomenon of the reconstruction of a

counterpast. Sandino and the Sandinista National Liberation Front provide a fine empirical example of this crucial movement process.

CHAPTER III

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

In 1522 Spanish conquistador Gil González Dávila arrived in Nicaragua and claimed it for Spain. Chief Diriangén led thousands of warriors against the Spaniards to prevent conquest. In 1912 Benjamín Zeledón led a revolt against Conservative Adolfo Díaz' regime as it allowed US political and banking interests to dictate Nicaraguan policy. Finally, Augusto César Sandino mounted a revolution in 1927 against the occupation of Nicaragua by United States Marines and US interference in the politics and economy of Nicaragua. During that struggle, Sandino linked himself historically to Diriangén and Zeledón as well as to Simón Bolívar, liberator of the Americas. Later, the Sandinista National Liberation Front made Sandino the historical center of its revolution. Therefore, understandings of Nicaraguan history by General Sandino and the contemporary Sandinistas also drive that history.

In preparation for examining the various constructions of history by the principle players in Nicaragua's twentieth century revolutions, this chapter will provide an overview of the history of Nicaraguan politics and economics. A focus of this overview is the intricate relationship between Nicaragua and the United States because that relationship is a focus of both Sandino and the Sandinista Front. Admittedly, this author is guilty of reconstructing a little history in order to summarize hundreds of years into a few pages here.

Nicaraguan Politics and Sandinismo

Through military conquest, disease, Christianization and slavery, the Spanish of the sixteenth century conquered the indigenous peoples of what is now Nicaragua. Until independence, Nicaragua was a Spanish colony and part of the Captaincy General of Guatemala. As did other Latin American countries in the 1820s, Nicaragua tired of several decades of supplying Spain with raw materials and Indian slaves, and Nicaraguans declared independence. For one and one-half years, Mexico and all of Central America were joined in one empire. Later, the Central American Federation separated from Mexico and formed a single republic. Finally, after war among the five Central American provinces, the Republic of Nicaragua was established in 1838 (Booth, 1985; Walker, 1991).

The regional war left Nicaragua in an economic depression. Additionally, Booth (1985) states that population dispersal due to the war, extreme regional loyalties, and recurring political unrest combined with foreign pressures to frustrate Nicaraguan decision-makers in their attempts to fuel economic growth. Foreign interests in Nicaragua focused principally on the desires of Great Britain and the United States to construct an interoceanic canal through Nicaragua connecting the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. Nicaragua offered the best route for such a canal because navigable waters stretched from the Atlantic almost to the Pacific, and a canal needed to be constructed only a short distance. Even so, the difficulty and cost of such an undertaking was substantial.

Meanwhile, American railroad magnate Cornelius Vanderbilt established the Accessory Transit Company to transport passengers and freight from the US west coast to its east coast through Nicaragua and in 1849 obtained concessions to build the prized

Nicaraguan canal. A year later, the US and British governments agreed to joint control of passage across Nicaragua through the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. Neither government consulted the Nicaraguans about this agreement (Diederich, 1981). Then in 1855, William Walker, a North American from Tennessee who had fought in Mexico and who was an advocate of manifest destiny, invaded Nicaragua with fifty-seven men. He was hired by Nicaraguan Liberals, with financing by Vanderbilt's company, to oust the Conservative government which was dominated by a few aristocratic families. The Conservatives surrendered, and Walker installed himself as president of the republic. The US government did not object to Walker's administration and officially recognized it. By 1856, the southern slave states in the US saw Nicaragua's plantation potential as an opportunity for slavery expansion and threw their support to Walker as he legalized slavery in Nicaragua. Nevertheless, strong Nicaraguan sentiment against the Liberal-supported Walker presidency, opposition in other Central American countries, in addition to Vanderbilt's influence in Washington, served to topple Walker's regime in 1857 and bring Conservatives back into power. Interestingly, Vanderbilt later declined to build the Nicaraguan canal and became a major shareholder in the Panamanian canal. Stung by Vanderbilt's abandonment of a Nicaraguan canal project and by US support of Walker in spite of Nicaragua's historical support of Vanderbilt and US interests, Conservatives became hostile toward US policy (Booth, 1985; Walker, 1991).

From 1857 to 1893, Conservatives dominated the Nicaraguan government. The Conservatives reconciled their differences with the US and attempted to emulate the US economic system but did not include the liberal reforms adopted in the US system. The wealthy landholders took Indian lands by force for coffee plantations and lumbering, and

the Indians worked on these plantations in a debt patronage system. US companies moved into Nicaragua and paid extremely low wages to peasants while exporting large amounts of Nicaraguan produce and raw materials (Rius, 1982).

At this time a Liberal, José Santos Zelaya, became president and champion of reform as he abolished the death penalty, separated church and state, initiated free public education, challenged the power of the landed elite, and canceled concessions to US businesses while encouraging investment by other foreign powers. Conservative resistance to Zelaya resulted in governmental retaliation against its opposition. The United States government and US businesses, as well as other foreign investors, grew increasingly hostile toward Zelaya as he demanded that foreign business adhere to Nicaraguan law and regulations. Therefore, the United States supported two Conservative generals to fight Zelaya. Additionally, four hundred US Marines landed on the eastern coast to protect American interests. The US government then demanded Zelaya's resignation. Zelaya did resign in 1909, and the Conservatives ultimately regained power (Walker, 1991). Lake (1989: 48) argues that the US intervened (in Nicaragua as well as other Central American and Caribbean nations) for a variety of reasons in addition to economic motivations:

> ...Washington's growing (and sometimes nearly paranoid) fears of domestic instability or foreign (other than American) influence in the region; habits of the American mind, including a belief in a manifest mission, even responsibility, to bring order and democracy to the lesser nations of the hemisphere; and the desire of Nicaraguan political leaders of all stripes to put the power of the United States behind their own political fortunes.

Lake (1989) emphasizes the US government's obsession with stability in the region. Apparently, Zelaya was making overtures to the British and Japanese in regard to

building a Nicaraguan canal. The potential competition of a British-owned canal with the American canal in Panama rekindled US fears of British meddling in the hemisphere. At the same time that Zelaya was threatening the stability of North American business interests, he was attacking Honduras. Therefore, the US concern was to insure regional stability in addition to protecting its investments. This particular concern "was joined in the minds of American policy makers with the view that Central American peoples lacked the traditions and the power to preserve their own domestic and international peace" (Lake, 1989: 49). Additionally, Theodore Roosevelt and the British signed the Hay-Pauncefote treaty in 1901 allowing the US sole rights to build a trans-isthmian canal. Roosevelt also announced in 1905 that the United States would bear the responsibility of policing the Americas to maintain order. In 1914 the Bryan-Chamorro treaty increases and solidifies US canal rights and control of Nicaraguan policy. Hence, control and intervention were the North Americans' preferred means of relating to Nicaragua (Booth, 1985).

Conservative leaders began to fight among one another, and Minister of War Mena revolted against President Adolfo Díaz in 1912. Benjamín Zeledón, a Liberal supporter of Zelaya and a lawyer and teacher, also mounted an insurrection against the Conservative government. In order to once again restore stability, the US Marines landed and finally captured and shot Zeledón. The Díaz government survived. This time, the Marines stayed until 1925 (Booth, 1985; Walker, 1991).

By 1925, the US government was ready to withdraw the Marines for a variety of reasons. However, the American concern with stability was cause for hesitation. At the time, a Conservative-Liberal coalition government was in power in Nicaragua. The US

announced its intention of withdrawing the Marines, and Conservative president Solórzano agreed to create a national police force to replace the departing Marines. This arrangement satisfied the North American desire for stability and the Nicaraguan president's desire to maintain his personal political power. The National Guard, headed by a retired US Army major, filled the void left by the Marines and quickly became a major political actor in Nicaraguan politics for years to come (Booth, 1985; Kamman, 1968).

The absence of US Marines from Nicaraguan soil was short-lived. By the spring of 1926, they had returned to protect American investments and lives in the wake of first, a Conservative revolt in late 1925 and then a Liberal rebellion in 1926. The rebellion was becoming a civil war, and Marines were stationed in all parts of Nicaragua. In 1927, the US sent Henry L. Stimson to Nicaragua to negotiate with the Liberal rebels. Stimson offered inducements to the rebels but also implied that, if they did not come to a peaceful agreement, the Marines would fight them. Hence, Stimson succeeded in negotiating a peace treaty. The subsequent Liberal-Conservative peace treaty also allowed a US supervised presidential election in 1928. In spite of Stimson's best efforts, the fighting did not stop. One rebel named Sandino refused to lay down his arms and a guerrilla war ensued (Kamman, 1968).

Augusto César Sandino was born in 1895 and grew up in Niquinohomo, a small town in Nicaragua largely populated by Indians. The region in which he lived was the most densely populated in Nicaragua, and most of the people worked on the coffee plantations. Sandino’s mother was a plantation worker, and his father was the owner of

the coffee plantation on which she worked. His parents never married one another. Sandino lived first with his peasant mother and later, with his father.

Apparently, Sandino's political awareness began while living with his father, who was a devoted Liberal. At seventeen, Sandino saw the body of the insurrectionist Zeledón being taken to the cemetery. Sandino would say years later, "The death of Zeledón gave me the key to our national situation opposite the North American piracy, for that reason; the war in which we have been engaged, we consider it a continuation of that [Zeledón's death] " (Sandino, 1981a: 306).

Sandino left his father's house and Nicaragua at age twenty after wounding a man in a fight and took a series of jobs in Honduras, Guatemala, and Mexico. While working for a North American oil company in Tampico, Mexico, Sandino grew increasingly angry at US intervention in Nicaraguan affairs. Years later, he would relate a story about how a fellow worker shamed him into returning to Nicaragua to fight foreign interests. Sandino claims he was reading a newspaper and telling his fellow workers that the Nicaraguan situation was so grave that he was considering a return to his country to take up arms against foreign intervention. One of the men responded, "All of you Nicaraguans would just as soon sell out your country" (Ramirez, 1981: 26). This comment piqued Sandino's conscience as he decided that non-involvement was tantamount to actively betraying his country. Therefore, Sandino returned to Nicaragua and joined the rebels fighting US occupation.

The rebel army was composed of liberal land- and business-owners as well as workers and peasants. As previously stated, the United States intervened in 1927 and supervised an armistice and peace agreement with rebel leader General Moncada and the

revolutionaries (Jung, 1983). The terms of the Espino Negro peace plan involved adhering to US demands of maintaining Díaz in the presidency, general disarmament and amnesty for both sides, elections supervised by the US, a cabinet that included Liberals, and the organization of a National Guard by the US and commanded by US officers with the continued occupation of Nicaragua by the Marines (Bermann, 1986). The workers and peasants under Sandino's leadership rejected the terms of the peace settlement as another example of Yankee imperialism and of Nicaraguans "selling out" their country. Thus, began Sandino's six-year guerrilla war against foreign intervention in Nicaraguan affairs. Sandino's aim was the ouster of all US military presence and the establishment of true national sovereignty (Lozano, 1985).

Initially, Sandino was ignored or considered only an irritant by Nicaraguan political leaders and US officials. They belittled him by calling him a "bandit" (Beals, 1932: 306).[11] These elites were also occupied with preparing for the 1928 Nicaraguan elections and with reorganizing the National Guard. US Marines provided training and leadership for the Guard. Consequently, the US again withdrew many of its forces as the Nicaraguan National Guard showed promise of being an effective substitute for the Marines (Booth, 1985; Kamman, 1968).

---

[11] American journalist Carlton Beals interviewed Sandino and then reported the visit to US Marine General Feland. The following exchange (Beals, 1932: 306) reveals the vulnerability of the official labeling of Sandino as a bandit:

> Feland - "What do you think of Sandino?"
> Beals - "He is not a bandit, call him a fool, a fanatic, an idealist, a patriot, according to your point of view, but certainly he is not a bandit."
> Feland - "Of course, in the army, we use the word 'bandit' in a technical sense, meaning the member of a band."
> Beals - "Then [John Phillip] Sousa is also a bandit?"

Nicaraguan and United States' officials began to take Sandino more seriously as Sandino's determination showed no signs of waning during the passing months. However, the soldiers in Sandino's army only numbered, on average, between three hundred and five hundred men, peaking at perhaps one thousand (Booth, 1985). To compensate for its small number and to avoid direct confrontation with the Guard and US forces as well as US airplanes, Sandino's Army for the Defense of the National Sovereignty of Nicaragua (EDSNN) adopted guerrilla tactics. They moved in small numbers in areas sympathetic to their cause (generally the northern departments) and used the local people for intelligence gathering (Booth, 1985; Macaulay, 1985).

The war continued until 1933. Despite the Guard's best efforts and the Marines' presence, the government never gained control over Sandino's forces. In addition, Liberal candidate General Moncada won the 1928 presidential election. This event represented an important victory for the Liberals even though Sandino and many Liberals believed the General to be a traitor for agreeing to Stimson's peace treaty. Another Liberal, Juan Batista Sacasa, won the 1932 election. In spite of the US government's historical preference for conservative Nicaraguan presidents, US officials were, by 1928, comfortable with Liberal presidents as the US expanded its influence in Nicaragua through economic, political, and military agreements (Walker, 1991).

Finally, Herbert Hoover decided to withdraw US troops from Nicaragua in 1933. Booth (1985) argues that the withdrawal was due to the severe financial drain on the Nicaraguan government, the effects of the worldwide Depression which increased peasant support for Sandino's struggle against the status quo, the expansion of the war into previously unaffected areas, and rising disapproval of the intervention by the US

Congress. The withdrawal not only meant victory for Sandino but a power vacuum in the National Guard as the American officers left also. Therefore, President Sacasa, with advice of the US ambassador, appointed Moncada's ambitious, thirty-seven year old aide - Anastasio Somoza García - as new commander of the National Guard.

As Sandino had promised, Sandino entered into peace negotiations with Sacasa upon the US withdrawal. Sandino's men received land and amnesty, and Sacasa appointed one of Sandino's advisors, Sofónias Salvatierra, to his cabinet. In spite of the war's end, the Guard's suspicion and hatred of Sandino did not diminish. This hatred ultimately led to Sandino's death (Booth, 1985; Salvatierra, 1934).

Sandino, his father, Salvatierra, and two of Sandino's generals visited the presidential palace in Managua one evening in February 1934 to further discuss terms of peace. Upon leaving the palace, their car was stopped at the palace gate by Somoza's soldiers in an apparently stalled National Guard vehicle. Sandino's generals sensed trouble and drew their guns, but Sandino convinced them not to fire. A major dressed as a corporal then arrested the five men and took their guns. A witness rushed to the palace to tell Sacasa of the arrest, and Sacasa called the guard-post. His call was unanswered. Sandino asked to speak with Somoza but was denied. Ultimately, Salvatierra and Sandino's father were jailed, and Sandino and his generals were driven to the airfield on the outskirts of Managua where they were shot and killed (Selser, 1981).

The assassination of Sandino exemplifies Somoza's ruthless determination to seize power in Nicaragua. The Guard killed not only Sandino and two generals that night but Sandino's brother and about three hundred of Sandino's followers. Apparently, the murders of Sandino and his followers helped Somoza consolidate his already growing

power over the National Guard. He then used this power to constitutionally clear his way to the presidency and then to force Sacasa's resignation. Somoza won the subsequent election- that he arranged - and became Nicaragua's president (Millett, 1966).

The National Guard became Somoza's instrument for controlling almost every facet of Nicaraguan life. Of course, the Guard was Nicaragua's army and acted as its police force. It managed the prisons and controlled the communications networks, the postal service, and immigration service. The Guard also operated railroads, the National Health Service, collected taxes, and spied on dissident Nicaraguans. Not surprisingly, repression became synonymous with Somoza and the Guard (Crawley, 1979). Somoza used the Guard to kidnap, torture and kill his enemies as well as to harass the opposition press and to corrupt elections in his favor.

In addition to being personally charming, Somoza (nicknamed Tacho) endeared himself to the United States by becoming an ardent anti-fascist as US officials worried about Axis activities in the late 1930s. Later, when US President Eisenhower helped to depose Arbenz - a socialist constitutionally elected to Guatemala's presidency - Somoza became an ardent anti-communist. The US ambassador to Nicaragua in the 1950s became especially close to Somoza, thereby cementing the relationship between Somoza and the US (Booth, 1985; Walker, 1991).[12]

Not only did Somoza control his own people and ingratiate himself into

[12] An often repeated story reflects the close ties between Somoza and the US President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Roosevelt was reviewing a list of Heads of State to be invited to the White House. Roosevelt picked Somoza's name and said, "Isn't that man supposed to be a son of a bitch?" Secretary of State Cordell Hull replied, "He sure is, but he is our son of a bitch!" (Crawley, 1979: 99)

American favor, he also managed to become extremely wealthy during his tenure as president-dictator. During World War II, Tacho confiscated German and Italian properties and auctioned them - making sure that he purchased the most desirable properties at bargain prices. He enjoyed an extraordinary income as president and National Guard chief and acquired other vast landholdings and ample returns on investments in the country's major exports. He also received kickbacks for granting of concessions to foreign and domestic interests and from gambling, prostitution and alcohol operations. In addition, he passed import restriction laws and then created a contraband organization to circumvent the law as he sold the goods in his own stores. By the time of his death, Somoza owned coffee plantations, textile factories, a huge diary, a merchant marine, and the national airline among other businesses (Booth, 1985; Diederich, 1986; Walter, 1993).

In spite of Somoza's stronghold on the country, he was subject to several attempts to oust him from power. Conservative General Emiliano Chamorro tried to spark the revolutionary overthrow of Somoza in 1947, but the plan was aborted when Mexican police seized the revolutionaries' weapons that had been collected in Mexico and were en route to Nicaragua. Former Sandinistas tried as well. The last attempted ouster was successful. A young Nicaraguan poet, Rigoberto López Pérez, returned to Nicaragua from years in El Salvador plotting to topple Somoza's regime. In September 1956 he attended a political celebration given in Somoza's honor and shot and killed the dictator at close range. Of course, López was shot instantly by Somoza's body guards (Walker, 1991).

Somoza's oldest son Luis became president and initiated a somewhat softer style of governing Nicaragua than that of his father. The younger son, Anastasio Somoza Debayle, headed the National Guard and seemed to inherit his father's penchant for ironfisted rule. Luis distanced himself publicly from the Guard's sordid activities under Anastasio. However, he seems to have privately supported his brother's use of the Guard in acts of repression such as torture, kidnapping, and murder (Booth, 1985). Therefore, Walker (1991: 30) calls Luis' rule one of "cosmetic liberalization."

Luis ruled either as President or from behind the scenes until his death in 1963 when Anastasio became president. Tachito had close ties to the US. He graduated from Lasalle Military Academy in New York and West Point, and he spoke excellent English. These credentials, in combination with his political skills, allowed him to become fast friends with US officials. Under his regime, US economic and military aid to Nicaragua rose as the US increasingly feared communist influence in the region spurred by Castro's revolution in Cuba (Diederich, 1991).

In virtually every way, Tachito's term paralleled that of his father. Nicaraguan society became even more stratified than before as the agricultural sector industrialized leaving thousands jobless. These people migrated to the cities creating enormous slums. The December 1972 earthquake in Managua aggravated the situation by killing ten thousand persons and destroying thousands of lower-class homes and businesses. Somoza's response to the disaster was to pocket foreign emergency aid, sell emergency relief supplies of food, medicine and building supplies on the blackmarket, invest in construction industries and real estate, and generally ignore the misery of his own people (Kinzer, 1991).

The earthquake and Somoza's attitude toward it proved to be the salt applied to an already festering wound. At this point, the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) rose to the forefront of the Nicaraguan political opposition. Since Sandino's death, there had been various attempts at a coups de etat. , but all had failed. The FSLN had been formed in 1961 by Carlos Fonseca, Tomás Borge, Silvio Mayorga, and Santos López (one of Sandino's generals who escaped the Guard the night of Sandino's murder). Fonseca was responsible for collecting and reworking Sandino's ideology to serve as the basis for the new movement. Fonseca mixed the populism and patriotism of Sandino with Marxism-Leninism (Hodges, 1986). The result was an ideology that carried the Sandinistas through the next eighteen years of revolution.

While Sandino's original war against Yankee imperialism had been a war of the peasantry, the FSLN cultivated a multifaceted strategy aimed at building a popular revolution. In addition to depending upon the peasantry for support, the Sandinistas organized university student unrest in Nicaragua's major cities. They formed small clandestine study groups in order to learn of Sandino's work and thought (Cabezas, 1985). In addition, Fonseca began to disseminate Sandino's thought and to prepare the populace for armed struggle against Somoza and the National Guard. The Sandinistas also allied themselves with Nicaraguan labor unions and with liberal theological circles (Booth, 1985; Hodges, 1992).

The contemporary Sandinistas adopted Sandino's guerrilla tactics and saw their struggle as a continuation of Sandino's guerrilla war against foreign intervention in Nicaragua (Lozano, 1985). As compliments to the day-to-day guerrilla attacks on National Guard units and other strategic sites, the FSLN engaged in some spectacular

operations. In 1974, the Sandinistas invaded a party given by Nicaragua's former Minister of Agriculture and took all the guests hostage. Guests such as the Nicaraguan ambassador to Washington and the Foreign Minister were finally exchanged for $5 million and several imprisoned Sandinistas, one of which was Daniel Ortega. Then in 1978, the FSLN staged an assault on the National Palace capturing many members of the Nicaraguan Congress. In exchange for the lives of the hostages, the FSLN received a half million dollars in ransom and the freedom of sixty imprisoned Sandinistas, including Tomás Borge (García Márquez, 1979).

As Somoza's repressive tactics and corruption intensified, the FSLN gained widespread support. Among other things, Somoza's behavior in the aftermath of the 1972 earthquake spurred widespread discontent with the regime as evidenced by the 1978 formation of Los Doce (the Group of Twelve). Los Doce consisted of twelve Nicaraguan business leaders, clergy, and intellectuals who issued a public statement calling for the overthrow of Somoza and endorsing the inclusion of the FSLN in Nicaragua's post-Somoza government and reconstruction effort. The murder of Pedro Joaquín Chamorro, long-time opposition leader and member of Los Doce, spontaneously brought thousands of Nicaraguans to participate directly in the revolution. Chamorro had been publishing the only opposition newspaper (La Prensa) in Nicaragua and was a bitter political enemy of Somoza. One morning in 1978, he was shot multiple times on the streets of Managua. Riots erupted in Managua only hours after the shooting, and the rioters blamed Somoza for the murder of Chamorro (Lake, 1989). Bloody urban insurrections arose in virtually every major Nicaraguan city and continued throughout the next year. Somoza used tanks and machine guns purchased from the US to quell the uprisings. Eventually, Somoza's

behavior became reprehensible even to Conservatives within the US government. In 1979, President Jimmy Carter, the US Congress and the American public were repulsed by the execution on June 20 of an unarmed American journalist (Bill Stewart of ABC News) by a Nicaraguan National Guardsman - an event captured on videotape by Stewart's cameraman. The tape was smuggled out of Nicaragua that day and broadcast all over the world that night. Shortly thereafter, President Carter sought Somoza's resignation (Diederich, 1991; Kinzer 1991). Somoza did step down in July 1979 and was exiled from Nicaragua only to be murdered the next year in Paraguay.

On 19 July 1979 the Sandinistas claimed an unconditional victory. They had never been interested in simply ridding the country of Somoza but instead intended to reorganize the political, social and economic structures of Nicaragua. Toward those ends, the Sandinistas chose to create a new government that would encourage the participation of all sectors of society, usually on a proportional basis. They installed an executive branch called the Governing Junta of National Reconstruction (JGRN), which had been organized shortly before victory. The Junta consisted of two wealthy Conservatives (Violeta Barrios de Chamorro, widow of Pedro Joaquín Chamorro and an owner of La Prensa and Alfonso Robelo Callejas, an industrialist, leader in the business community, and head of the National Democratic Movement), one pro-Sandinista intellectual from the Group of Twelve (Sergio Ramírez Mercado, a US-educated novelist), and two members of the FSLN (Daniel Ortega, one of the nine-member FSLN National Directorate and Moíses Hassán, US-educated scientist and leader of the FSLN-affiliated United People's Movement). The JGRN executed decisions by consensus and generally followed guidelines set by the National Directorate of the FSLN. The new

Council of State was the representative legislative body including parties that were pro-Sandinista as well as opposition parties. The revolutionary government also revamped the judicial system and created a fourth branch of government (the Supreme Electoral Council) to oversee election and voter registration and education. The first nationwide election in 1984 under the revolutionary government was heavily scrutinized and approved by international observers and brought the election of Daniel Ortega as president and Sergio Ramírez as vice-president (Walker, 1991).

After their sweeping victory, the Sandinistas encouraged, in addition to the political pluralism indicated above, a mixed economy with significant participation from the private sector, foreign relations with as many nations as possible in spite of ideologies, and a wide variety of social programs for the formerly oppressed Nicaraguan people. For example, the Sandinistas nationalized and redistributed all Somoza property and nationalized the banking and insurance industries while simultaneously providing large loans to the private sector and access to foreign currency at low exchange rates. They also left most of the productive and commercial sectors in private hands but with increased government oversight (Conroy, 1985). Examples of the Sandinistas' foreign policy are that the revolutionary government chose to honor Somoza's $1.6 billion foreign debt in order to maintain Nicaragua's international credit and expanded its array of trading partners so that it might depend less on the United States for trade but still hoping for positive economic relations with the US. New social programs included labor-intensive public works projects to decrease unemployment, enforcing minimum wage laws, and transferring confiscated land to private farm cooperatives, individual landless peasants, and state farms. The government also improved hospitals and clinics,

instituted an ambitious program of preventive health care, made food staples available at controlled, reasonable prices, promoted more affordable housing through government construction, giving deeds to the homeless and rent controls, and reduced the rate of illiteracy in the country from fifty percent to thirteen percent in just five months through a national literacy crusade (Walker, 1991).

In their first one and a half years in power, the Sandinistas made significant strides toward their original goals for Nicaragua. However, the election of Ronald Reagan to the US presidency more than exacerbated a reconstruction situation of more than overwhelming obstacles such as years of looting by the Somocistas and the devastation brought by the revolutionary war. The Reagan administration was adamantly opposed to Sandinista rule in Nicaragua. Many of the Sandinista officials were indeed Marxists and, thus, in Reagan's eyes, threats to the United States. Therefore, by the end of 1981, Reagan had approved a joint effort by the US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and Nicaraguan counterrevolutionaries (contras) to attempt to militarily destabilize and eventually overthrow the Sandinista government. The CIA provided weapons, uniforms, supplies and training for the contra army and arranged for the contras to have their bases just across the Nicaraguan border in Honduras (Kinzer, 1991).

The contras never came close to military victory but did manage to frustrate Sandinista efforts to rebuild Nicaraguan society. The contras targeted infrastructure and Sandinista programs such as farm cooperatives and rural electrical projects. The Sandinistas were obligated to divert precious resources to a massive defense buildup and away from programs intended to raise the standard and quality of living for Nicaraguans.

Meanwhile, the Sandinistas domestic political situation began to worsen as they responded to the national emergency brought about by the contra war. The decrease in social spending and accompanying lack of economic recovery meant that the Sandinistas could not deliver on many of their promises to the populace, and their domestic opposition capitalized on the worsening social and economic conditions. Some censorship of the national media and periodic government closure of media such as La Prensa brought much domestic and international criticism. Human rights organizations criticized Nicaraguan government as the Sandinistas, in an effort to move people out of the war zone, initiated the forced migration of several thousand Miskitu Indians from the Río Coco to inland camps. The opposition also attacked the Sandinistas as economic sanctions against Nicaragua by the US meant that Nicaraguans were without US aid as well as spare parts for their US-made goods among other things. In addition, the sanctions caused the Sandinistas to rely ever more heavily on other countries, including the Socialist bloc, for economic and militarily aid as well as consumer goods. Of course, the increasing reliance of Nicaragua on countries like the Soviet Union and Cuba fueled Reagan's case for overthrow of the Sandinistas and further angered and frightened the restive Nicaraguan private sector.

Even as the Reagan administration escalated its economic and military attacks on Nicaragua, the Sandinistas continuously expressed a willingness to negotiate with the US but refused to negotiate with the contras. While expressing the desire for a diplomatic solution, Nicaragua continued to maintain its military defenses and also opened a legal front against the US. The Nicaraguan government complained to the United Nations on several occasions about the US-sponsored contra aggression. It also brought charges

against the United States government in the International Court of Justice in 1984. The charges involved treaty violations, in particular CIA involvement in the mining of Nicaragua's harbors in 1983. In 1986 the justices, in a vote of 15-0, condemned US support of the contras (Kinzer, 1991). The Court also decreed that the United States should pay Nicaragua over $17 billion in restitution for damages. In response, the Reagan administration claimed that the World Court no longer had jurisdiction over the US in matters involving Central America.

In 1982 Venezuela, Colombia, Panama, and Mexico joined together to attempt to find a peaceful resolution to the war in Nicaragua as well as resolutions to other Central American conflicts. Nicaragua agreed to participate in what came to be called the Contadora process, and the United States stated publicly that it supported Contadora. However, the US continued to fund the contras and strongly criticized Contadora and refused to support the process after Nicaragua made several concessions and agreed to sign the draft Contadora peace accord. Finally years later, due to the work of President Oscar Arias of Costa Rica, the presidents of the countries of Costa Rica, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua drafted and signed an agreement in 1987. In addition to many provisions of the agreements, one highly important aspect of this treaty was that all five countries agreed that external aid to irregular military forces must cease, thus condemning US aid to the contras and committing Honduras to disallow contra bases within its borders. Essentially, the aim was to end the war. With the signing of the Arias peace plan, conditions did slowly begin to stabilize in Nicaragua. Then in 1988, the Sandinistas and the contras entered into negotiations with Cardinal Obando y Bravo as

mediator and agreed on a peace treaty. Nevertheless, the war continued through 1989 (Kinzer, 1991).

The Nicaraguan elections of February 1990 resulted in the electoral defeat of the FSLN's presidential candidate Daniel Ortega and brought Violeta Barrios de Chamorro to the presidency as the candidate of the National Opposition Union (UNO). Many Nicaraguan voters came to believe that the only way to stop the contra war and US economic sanctions was to vote the Sandinistas out of power. While stunned by the election results, the Sandinistas accepted them, submitted to constitutional law and delivered the presidency to Chamorro (Brentlinger, 1995). Chamorro did not have a political background but had great symbolic appeal as the widow of Pedro Joaquín Chamorro, and she enjoyed the support of the Bush administration. Thus, her election did bring easing of US military, economic, and diplomatic pressure on Nicaragua (Close, 1999).

The new government did make many changes, including the reversal of several Sandinista initiatives. Chamorro, in response to US pressure, emphasized privatization by delivering formerly confiscated somocista property to the private sector and illegally firing government employees in order to downsize the public sector. Additionally, US Senator Jesse Helms stalled the delivery of $300 million in much needed already appropriated US economic aid by insisting that confiscated property be returned to its original owners or their family members and that Sandinista military and police officials be fired. The United States also pressured the Chamorro government to forgive the payment of restitution ordered by the World Court for the mining of Nicaraguan harbors. Even though UNO intensely disliked the Sandinistas, Chamorro retained several

Sandinistas in the government in order to avoid angering the largest political party in the country (Close, 1999).

US Multinational Corporations and Nicaragua

United States businesses began entering Latin America in earnest during the latter half of the nineteenth century. Latin Americans often decry this expansion as imperialist. Swansbrough (1976: 13) states that while the US did acquire territory in the late 1800s, its principal thrust was to create an "informal empire." This type of empire called for economic penetration into foreign territories or nations through trade with them or manufacturing or commercial ventures.

At the turn of the century, the people of the United States adhered to an ideology that characterized the foreign expansion of American business as patriotic, benevolent, and good for business. It is also an ideology that viewed the hemisphere as belonging to the US. Adams (1914: 9, 13) provides an example of North American attitudes toward the subject during the late 1800s and early 1900s:

> There is one dominant reason why the American tropics have not participated in the stupendous progress of all other tropical sections, and that reason is this: Instability of their governmental conditions has estopped [sic] the capital and the enterprise of the world from undertaking the development of their wonderful tropical resources. For this state of affairs the United States is largely to blame. Our national sins are not those of commission, but of omission. We have paid no attention to the welfare of our tropical neighbors for the purely selfish and ignorant reason that we did not consider the matter worth our while.
>
> It has not yet dawned on our political leaders that *our* tropics are a great but unused asset... [my italics]
>
> [The story of the development of the United Fruit Company] is a story of the peaceful and honorable conquest of a portion of the American tropics, and one of which every citizen should be proud.

American rhetoric of the day included terms that suggested militaristic or imperialistic intentions. Highly successful industrialization in the United States and the subsequent search for raw materials and new markets in the 1890s spurred the US expansion into Latin America and into Nicaragua specifically. Weber (1983: 102) notes, "The strong links between United States big business and the country's foreign policy were forged in these years."

Nicaragua began extensive coffee production in the 1860s. Exports of and profits from coffee increased greatly, and by 1890, coffee was the country's most important export. At this time, coffee exports represented fifty percent of all Nicaraguan exports (Weber, 1983). A critical result of the extensive coffee production was the integration of Nicaragua into the world capitalist system.

In the early 1890s, Liberals sought increased economic development in Nicaragua and further integration into the world economy. Liberal president Zelaya initiated policies that were largely successful in achieving these goals. Zelaya used revenues from coffee production to finance improvements in Nicaraguan education, transportation, and communication systems. He also encouraged foreign investment. Even though Zelaya courted foreign capital, he expected foreign investors to follow Nicaraguan law. He imposed stiff penalties on any company that failed in this regard. Obviously, North American business resisted Zelaya's efforts. After canceling several North American concessions, Zelaya was deposed by Conservatives allied with the US government (Booth 1985).

As noted previously, the serious interest of the US government and American business in Nicaragua had historically centered on finding a shortcut from the Atlantic to the Pacific via a canal through the country. And while the canal was never built in

Nicaragua, large amounts of North American capital penetrated the Central American nation in the 1890s. During this period, North American companies such as United Fruit Company and the Standard Fruit and Steamship Company established operations on Nicaragua's eastern coast and became major actors in the Nicaraguan economy (Crawley, 1979).

The foreign policies of Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft served to tie Nicaraguan economic and political systems to the wishes of Wall Street and the State Department. Most importantly, "dollar diplomacy" was instituted by Taft's Secretary of State Philander C. Knox in the first decade of the century. Knox believed that a stable economy led to a stable political environment and that a stable Latin America was critical to US hegemony in the hemisphere. Specifically, Taft and Knox feared European intervention and worried about any threats to North American investment if the Panama Canal were completed. US government officials also worried about large loans made to Nicaragua by British bankers during Zelaya's regime and the British intervention that might accompany such financial relationships. Therefore, the US made large loans to countries such as Nicaragua and encouraged US business to locate there (Bermann, 1986). The principal banks involved in this activity were Brown Brothers & Company, J. & W. Seligman & Company, and, later, Morgan Guaranty Trust Company.

The first significant involvement in Nicaragua by Brown Brothers and Seligman occurred in connection with the Knox-Castrillo treaty of 1911. In his efforts to secure US interests in Central America, Secretary Knox and Nicaraguan representative to Washington Salvador Castrillo signed a treaty arranging an American loan to Nicaragua to fund Nicaraguan debt. The terms of the agreement stated that the loan would be

secured by customs receipts. Nicaraguan customs would be collected and administered by a Collector General (a US citizen) selected by American bankers and the US State Department, approved by the US president, and then appointed by the Nicaraguan government. Nicaragua could not alter duties without permission from the United States. In return, Brown Brothers and Seligman would make the fifteen million dollar loan at six percent interest. The purpose of the loan was to reform the currency, re-fund Nicaragua's debt and build railroads (Denny, 1929.

President Taft supported the treaty, and the Nicaraguan Assembly ratified it. However, the US Senate refused to ratify Knox-Castrillo. When the treaty failed in the US Senate, the banks agreed to make a small loan, on a contract basis, of $1.5 million that soon became a series of small loans. The terms of the Knox-Castrillo treaty became part of the small loan contracts. The bankers reformed the currency by creating the National Bank of Nicaragua and making it the sole depository of Nicaraguan government funds and the sole bank of issue. The new National Bank was a US corporation (as it was incorporated in Connecticut) and its board of directors, consisting entirely of Brown Brothers' representatives save one Nicaraguan, met in New York. The US bankers appointed two North American financial experts to design the currency reform, and these experts replaced the Nicaraguan peso with a new córdoba note (Denny, 1929). The signature of the President of the National Bank of Nicaragua appearing on the paper córdoba is that of James Brown, senior partner of Brown Brothers & Company (Kouwenhoven, 1968).

In addition to instituting currency reform, the US bankers assumed management of the repayment of loans originally made by England to Nicaragua. The bankers used customs receipts to repay this loan as well as to repay themselves. Brown Brothers also

collected customs receipts to pay claims brought against the Nicaraguan government for concessions cancelled by the Zelaya regime and/or for damage suffered during civil wars - the majority of claims filed by United States companies. Incidentally, the validity of claims were decided by commissions with majority membership held by US citizens. Lastly, customs receipts could be used for the ordinary purposes of government, such as salaries. Another loan made by the North American bankers to the Nicaraguan government was secured by a lien against the Nicaraguan railroad granting fifty-one percent of the railroad's stock to the bankers who hired a US company, J.G. White Engineering Corporation, to manage the operation (Denny, 1929).

Loans to Nicaragua from US banks continued into the next US administration, despite President Woodrow Wilson's rhetorical opposition to dollar diplomacy. Also during Wilson's term, Brown Brothers and Seligman opened their first branch bank in Nicaragua in 1915 after Congress passed legislation in 1914 making it legal for US banks to open foreign branches. Also in 1915, the two US banks, with Morgan Guaranty Trust, organized the Mercantile Bank of the Americas with affiliated corporations throughout Latin America. The Latin American branch banks were managed by joint Mercantile Bank and local management, but Mercantile Bank held all or, at least, fifty-one percent of the stock. One of those affiliate corporations was the National Bank of Nicaragua. However, US banking interests suffered in the 1920s as the end of World War I brought a worldwide postwar economic crisis and brought England and Germany back to Latin America to compete with the US banks. As a result of these pressures, Mercantile Bank was dissolved and then reorganized in 1922 as the Bank of Central and South America but failed in 1924 and was sold to the Royal Bank of Canada (Stallings, 1987). At that

time, Brown Brothers sold its shares of stock to Guaranty Trust and left Nicaragua (Phelps, 1927).

It was also during Wilson's administration that the Bryan-Chamorro treaty was signed by Nicaragua and the United States. This agreement granted the US the exclusive rights to build a canal through Nicaragua, to ninety-nine year leases on Nicaragua's Corn Islands, and to the construction and maintenance of a naval base off Nicaragua's Pacific coast. Most importantly, the treaty gave the United States the right to control Nicaragua's foreign policy and to participate in its internal affairs at the discretion of US officials. Costa Rica and El Salvador, believing the treaty threatened their independence, opposed it and brought suit against Nicaragua in the Central American Court of Justice. The Court decided in favor of the plaintiffs. However, Nicaragua, with the support of the US, ignored the Court's decision. The Central American Court, a precursor for the International Court of Justice, never recovered from the act of the Wilson administration in disregarding the decision of the very tribunal that the US had helped to form in 1907. The Court dissolved a few years after its ruling against Nicaragua (Bermann, 1986).

During the first twenty years of the century, North American companies that had been established in Nicaragua during the 1890s were becoming giant conglomerates. US business interests, especially fruit and mining concerns, built company towns. Their Nicaraguan employees performed grueling work for long hours, shopped at company stores, and utilized company infirmaries/hospitals. Virtually all management personnel were US citizens and lived very well by Nicaraguan as well as North American standards. Division managers wielded great power over not only their towns but over Nicaraguan politics as well. Kepner (1967: 209) likens the fruit companies' to "vast feudal estates"

or "quasi-foreign settlements" run by "banana dictators" who enjoyed close ties to officials in the national government.

The United States' hold on the Nicaraguan political and economic systems was not lost on the Nicaraguan people. The omnipresence of North American businessmen, diplomats, and Marines engendered hostility among the populace. Nicaraguans also understood the advantages of foreign capital and did benefit from social improvements, such as some health care, provided by the companies. However, many Nicaraguans resented the country's financial predicament, the consequent need for foreign investment, and the foreigners who provided the "solution" (Kepner, 1967).

It was amidst this political and economic climate that Augusto César Sandino left Nicaragua and found employment with several North American conglomerates. After leaving Nicaragua in 1920, Sandino began work for the Standard Fruit and Steamship Company in La Ceiba, Honduras - Standard's base of operations in Central America. He worked at the company's Montecristo sugar mill as a mechanic and warehouseman until he got into some legal trouble and left Honduras. He arrived in Quiriguá, Guatemala in 1922. He was once again employed as a mechanic. This time he worked on a banana plantation for United Fruit.

In 1923 Sandino traveled from Guatemala to Mexico finding work as a mechanic in the Veracruz and Tampico oil fields of John D. Rockefeller's Standard Oil Company and for the Edward L. Doheny oil group. As previously noted, Sandino claimed to have formed his political and social philosophy condemning Yankee imperialism while working in the oil fields. Consequently, he returned to Nicaragua in 1926 with the express purpose of ridding his homeland of US intervention. Upon his arrival, he again was employed by a North American company. American owner Charles Butters hired

Sandino as a bookkeeper for San Albino Gold Mines. Unknown to Butters, Sandino had sought work at the mine with the intention of organizing miners to rebel against US domination (Román, 1979).

Even though there is little available material chronicling Sandino's relationship to these US-owned companies, there is much history written about their Latin American activities during Sandino's time. Knowledge of the historical situation of the industries with which Sandino had experience yields some understanding of Sandino's eventual attitudes and acts against the United States and its representatives.

Central America gained the reputation as "the Banana Republics" largely due to the tremendous amount of banana production maintained by North American fruit companies such as United and Standard. These two companies were foremost among banana growers and exporters/importers (Crawley, 1979). Because of their size, wealth, and influence, they were also the objects of Central American feelings of anti-Yankee imperialism. In fact, United Fruit gained with its notoriety the name El Pulpo (the Octopus).

United Fruit Company was the result of a partnership forged in 1899 by two Americans who were already involved to some extent in bringing bananas from Central America to the United States. Standard Fruit, under its original name of Vaccaro Brothers, first entered Honduras in the same year. United soon became the largest importer of bananas to the United States. Both companies concentrated their Central American efforts in Honduras and Guatemala. Nicaragua was never an important source of banana production for either company although both companies owned plantations there. In fact, Vaccaro Brothers' major interest in Nicaragua was the country's mahogany

harvested by Vaccaro's subsidiary the Bragman's Bluff Lumber Company (Karnes, 1978; Lafeber, 1984).

In 1920, the same year that Sandino reported for work at Vaccaro's sugar mill in La Ceiba, Honduras, Vaccaro Brothers was in the throes of a labor strike. Strikers claimed that Standard had illegally imported black Americans to work on the plantations and was paying them more than the amount paid to Honduran workers. After almost two months, the strike finally ended when the arrival and continued presence of a US naval vessel threatened the strikers with North American military intervention (Karnes, 1978).

The years 1920 and 1921 were a time of great expansion for the Vaccaro Brothers' Honduran interests. The company built more railroads to bring its bananas from plantations to awaiting ships, gained more concessions, and entered the lumber business in Honduras. The Honduran government was also receiving loans from Vaccaro's bank - Banco Atlántida. Terms of these loans included having Vaccaro's representatives supervise Honduran customs collections and withholding each month's loan repayment (Karnes, 1978).

United Fruit and Vaccaro Brothers employed probably hundreds of Nicaraguans in their Honduran operations by 1921. Most of the Nicaraguans had been exiled by the Nicaraguan government. The exiles demonstrated fierce anti-Yankee attitudes as a result of their resentment toward the Marine occupation of Nicaragua since 1912 (Karnes, 1978). Therefore, Sandino's experience in Vaccaro Brothers' (Standard Fruit) employ was probably one of intense exposure to the power wielded by North American business.

By 1922, when Sandino gained employment with the United Fruit Company in Guatemala, the company had been cultivating and shipping bananas in that country for sixteen years. United's first contract with Guatemala received 50,000 acres and paid the

government $14,000 annually plus an export tax of one cent per banana stem (May & Plaza, 1976). Originally, United Fruit, like its competitors, bought bananas from individual planters. However, United's vast landholdings were soon cultivated and became very productive.

Large scale banana production required railroads and docks. While Guatemala already had some railroads, United built and maintained its own extensive railroad system. The company also built port facilities as did Standard in La Ceiba. The ties between the fruit companies and Central America's railway systems and ports cannot be overemphasized. The companies financed the projects and, even though they gained the concessions by agreeing to allow use of the facilities by the host country, virtually monopolized usage of the rails and ports. By 1922, United was not only running Guatemala's railroads, ports, and shipping, but was also operating the communications system. United Fruit also provided loans to the Guatemalan government and collected payment by sitting in Guatemala's customs houses (as did Standard Fruit in Honduras). The company also enjoyed a monopoly on the banana trade in Guatemala - a situation which engendered much resentment among Guatemalans (LaFeber, 1984).

Sandino spent the next three years (1923-26) in the Mexican oil fields in Tampico and Veracruz. His employers were the Huasteca Petroleum Company and the South Pennsylvania Oil Company owned by California oilman Edward Doheny and Standard Oil of New Jersey, respectively. Doheny began Mexican operations in 1900, and was the largest oil producer in Mexico by the time that Standard acquired oil producing properties there in 1917 (Gibb & Knowlton, 1976).

By the time of Sandino's arrival, the Mexican government and the US oil companies had been locked in a vigorous dispute for several years. The post-

revolutionary Mexican constitution adopted in 1917 called for nationalization of Mexico's subsoil. At that time, and throughout the dispute, the US companies were enjoying enormous production rates and profits from their Mexican operations. The companies refused to recognize nationalization and fought imposition of the new law. Standard Oil urged Washington to send warships to Mexico and to sever diplomatic relations. Protests from Washington succeeded in causing the Mexican government to delay the deadline set for the companies to adhere to measures beginning the nationalization process. Finally, executives from several US oil companies and Mexico's Minister of Finance agreed that lands leased before 1917 were not subject to nationalization, but lands leased after 1917 were subject to constitutional constraints. By 1928 Standard had liquidated almost all of its interests in Mexico (Gibb & Knowlton, 1976).

Hodges (1986: 5) notes that at the time of Sandino's arrival in 1923 "Tampico was a hotbed of political agitation among oil workers." Strikes by Mexican workers against the US oil companies were common. Macaulay (1985: 52) notes, "The anarchist Industrial Workers of World dominated the Tampico labor movement until seriously challenged in the 1920s by newly formed communist groups, by purely Mexican radical unions, and by a more conservative, government-backed labor federation." Sandino could not have avoided exposure to all this anti-foreign business and anti-Yankee activity although it is unknown whether he participated in it. As previously mentioned, it was during Sandino's tenure in this environment that he decided to return to Nicaragua and fight Yankee imperialism.

Upon hearing news of the Liberal uprising in Nicaragua, Sandino left Mexico and traveled to Nicaragua. He found work as a bookkeeper in the San Albino Gold Mine

in the department of Nueva Segovia. North American mining companies first gained concessions in Nicaragua during the 1890s. The list of companies operating in the 1920s included the Bonanza Mines Company of Philadelphia, Cuje Gold Mines of California, La Luz & Los Angeles Mining Company of Pittsburgh, San Albino Gold Mines of California, and Tonopah Nicaragua Company of Nevada (Rand & Sturgess, 1931). The companies mined gold and silver which constituted major export items for Nicaragua (Mineral Industries of Latin America, 1981).

Mining interests ran their operations in much the same manner as did the fruit companies. They created company towns that were essentially isolated from other communities. A strict hierarchy of authority was in force. For example, many miners lived in company barracks, and the North American managers lived in houses provided by the company in a separate portion of the mining town. The two parts of town were not only separated geographically but visually as well. In the mining community of Siuna, hills hid the North American neighborhoods from the view of the Nicaraguan neighborhoods (CIERA, 1981: 174). The companies also exercised police powers within their towns and were supported in this activity by the Nicaraguan military.

Given the autonomy and power available to business interests in Latin America and Sandino's exposure to the situation, it is not surprising that Sandino made their operations targets of his guerrilla attacks. At various times during the war, Sandino ordered attacks on both United Fruit and Standard Fruit property. He also targeted US-owned mines. Sandino even attacked his former place of employment, the San Albino Gold Mines. The Mines Handbook of 1931 (Rand & Sturgess: 2804) relates the following observation about the San Albino mine:

> This mine was extensively developed and a mill was in profitable operation. Latest reports indicate that property is now idle due the damage done by the rebels under Sandino who for a time operated the mine but who wrecked the property when they left the vicinity.

Initially, Sandino launched his struggle from the San Albino mine and later made it one of his targets during the war. Upon gaining employment at the mine, Sandino convinced the miners that they were suffering great injustice at the hands of their North American employers and that they should demand higher pay. Ultimately, he organized them into a band of about thirty armed men and attacked a National Guard garrison. Sandino's men were easily repelled. He was thus convinced that he must join with the Liberal forces in order to be effective (Macaulay, 1985). The attacks from and on North American property supported Sandino's anti-imperialist rhetoric and clearly signaled that he intended to rid Nicaragua of not only political and military domination by the United States but economic domination as well.

Sandino's death brought the struggle against Yankee imperialism to a halt. After Sandino's murder and Somoza's rise to the presidency of Nicaragua, Somoza became fast friends with US government officials. Franklin D. Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy was wholly accepted by Somoza. Under the policy, the Export-Import Bank and the Inter-American Development Commission were instituted to promote development in Latin America. Bermann (1986: 232-33) summarizes the effects of the policy:

> [Nicaragua's agreements with these agencies] obliged [Nicaragua] to pledge itself to shun 'economic nationalism' by reducing or eliminating tariffs, encouraging foreign (which meant US) investment, and refraining from the use of customs protection to foster new industries...Nicaragua became an economic satellite of the United States, its role to supply raw materials, buy US industrial products, and absorb a portion of excess US investment capital when required.

During World War II, the US built three military bases in Nicaragua thus infusing more cash into the Nicaraguan economy. After World War II, Nicaragua enjoyed rapid economic growth. The government encouraged cotton production due to the increase of cotton prices on the world market. Yet the expansion of cotton production resulted in the demise of numerous small farms. Jobs in the cotton industry did not absorb all the displaced farmers, and urban migration led to swelling slums in Nicaragua's cities. The disappearance of so many independent farmers also meant that land and the wealth from cotton exports was concentrated in a few families. Meanwhile, North American investors were expanding their ties to Nicaraguan business and government (Jarquín & Barreto, 1986).

From 1955 to 1969, capital investment in Latin America by United States business interests more than tripled in comparison to the preceding fifteen years. Loans from the US government also increased during this period. Countries such as Nicaragua were compelled to fulfill the obligations of the Good Neighbor era. The US insured fulfillment as it channeled assistance funds through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank) and the Inter-American Development Bank as part of the Good Neighbor policy's successor, the Alliance for Progress. This new effort by the Kennedy administration was akin to dollar diplomacy in that it emphasized an infusion of financial assistance in order to promote a stable environment. However, Kennedy added significant military aid to the package because of his principal concern in containing the Cuban revolution (Stallings, 1988).

Kennedy's Alliance for Progress program embraced the Central American Common Market initially formed by the United Nations. The Common Market's original purpose was to encourage Central American industries to produce a greater quantity and

a wider variety of goods in order to reduce dependence on imported goods. The United States government viewed this organization as a vehicle for stemming communist influence in the isthmus. It was also an opportunity to encourage North American investment in Nicaragua. US investment in Nicaragua increased as North Americans began production in new enterprises and to enter the service industries. In sum, US investment accounted for seventy to eighty percent of total foreign investment in the country. In short, Bermann (1986: 248) writes, "Under American tutelage, the [Central American Common Market] became little more than a mechanism for encouraging foreign investment."

In spite of Nicaragua's economic growth during the 1960s, the economic condition of the average Nicaraguan remained unimproved. In contrast, Anastasio Somoza Debayle and his elite supporters were enjoying extraordinary wealth. Somoza gained much of his wealth through a variety of questionable activities; much of it came from joint ventures with North American multinational corporations.

North American capital dominated Nicaragua during the Somozas' reign. In 1969 United States companies owned eighty-six percent of all multinational businesses operating in Nicaragua (Castillo, 1980). The Somoza family turned this fact to its own advantage by using their powerful positions and their friendship with US officials and business interests to enlarge their personal bank accounts rather than the public coffers. Somoza Debayle, like his father Somoza García, used some of that wealth to acquire and monopolize Nicaraguan industries such as the dairy industry. He also entered into many joint ventures with US companies as mentioned above. For instance, seventy-four percent of Aceitera Corona S.A. (a vegetable oil company) was owned by United Brands (formerly United Fruit) and the remaining twenty-six percent belonged to the Somoza

family (Selser, 1981). In light of Somoza's strong economic and political ties to the United States, it is not surprising that he became known in Nicaragua as "the last Marine" (Bermann, 1986).

Multinational corporations from the United States were still dominating Nicaraguan economics and politics as the Sandinista revolution gathered force throughout the 1970s. FSLN Commander Jaime Wheelock (1977) argues that the Somoza family and North American banking interests controlled Nicaragua by controlling the country's primary industries including the cotton industry. In addition to banks, a wide variety of North American companies remained in Nicaragua. In spite of the devastation and danger of the war, US multinational corporations still constituted seventy-seven percent of all multinationals in Nicaragua by the time of the FSLN victory in 1979 (Castillo, 1980).

Sandinista rule obviously brought significant change to the Nicaraguan economy. Booth (1985: 239) mentions that the new government had three primary economic goals. First, the economy must simply be rebuilt after the long war. Second, there must be a redistrubution of income and economic power in order to reduce class inequality. Third, the economic base of the somocistas must be dismantled. Of course, the obstacles and problems were legion. One unforeseen problem was a sudden and severe lack of managers to run businesses as many were somocistas and fled the country. Nevertheless, the Sandinistas persevered and, for a time, surmounted many of those obstacles.

The reforms were wide-ranging and succeeded in varying degrees. The government instituted agrarian reform and encouraged peasants to organize on their own behalf. Food production increased, and coupled with the institution of price controls, food availability also increased. Tax revenues also increased, and the government

reduced the trade deficit. Investment in the public sector brought more jobs, and the Sandinistas enforced a minimum wage requirement. Workplace health and safety regulations were also enforced, and a health care program was introduced. All of these reforms became compromised with US efforts to damage the Nicaraguan economy and with the diversion of Nicaraguan government funds to fight the contra war (Booth, 1985; Walker, 1991).

After the Sandinista victory, foreign investment declined. Some of the decline was due to the Sandinista nationalization of business interests. The government nationalized mines, banks, insurance and transportation in addition to others. However, the government attempted to pay private owners for their companies. Nicaragua agreed to pay Neptune Mining Company of New York (majority owned by American Smelting & Mining Company) $3.7 million, plus interest, for minerals seized during nationalization of the company's gold mine (Audette & Kowalewski, 1983). In another sign of cooperation between the Sandinistas and US business, Bank of America and other Western banks loaned Nicaragua $25 million to help pay its foreign debt. On the other hand, in October 1982 Standard Fruit, exclusive marketer of Nicaraguan bananas for twelve years, pulled all of its banana operations out of Nicaragua in violation of its contract with the revolutionary government. Standard Fruit and the Sandinistas had agreed that Nicaragua was to purchase the Standard operation for $13 million and the company was to provide technical assistance and marketing over a five year period (Maxfield & Stahler-Shold, 1985).

In short, the Reagan administration's efforts to undermine the Nicaraguan economy and, therefore, the Sandinista government were fairly successful. As the US government blocked investment and trade in Nicaragua and mounted a war that drew

funds away from Nicaragua's internal social and economic programs, the revolutionary government was unable to fulfill all of its own hopes and its promises to the Nicaraguan people. Many people, even if they supported the revolution, grew tired of the economic pressure and voted the Sandinistas out of office in 1990. The new president, Violeta Chamorro, was much more palatable to the North Americans. In 1991, the Directory of American Firms reported Standard Fruit to again be operating in Nicaragua along with Citibank, American Life Insurance and Pan-American Life Insurance, among other US multinationals.

Conclusion

This overview has served to set the stage, in some sense, for the four histories of Nicaragua and Sandino that follow in the next four chapters. Clearly, the United States and Nicaragua have a history of strong political and economic ties. The relationship between the two countries has been asymmetrical, and many Nicaraguans have resented the power advantage held by the US. In addition to coping with the anger and frustration toward a foreign power, Nicaraguans were faced with the daily task of living under the rule of repressive dictators and national police forces supported by North Americans. Under these conditions, Nicaraguans were experiencing what Weber calls distress when Sandino led them in the struggle against US economic and political domination and, later, when the Sandinista National Liberation Front assumed leadership. The interpretation of these conditions as distress and cause for action by Nicaraguans constituted a reconstruction of Nicaragua's past that seriously challenged the story of Nicaragua's past offered through official rhetoric and officially sanctioned accounts of Nicaraguan history.

CHAPTER IV

SANDINO'S EMERGENCE: THE LIVING SANDINO

Sandino introduced himself to Nicaragua at the age of thirty-one during his unsuccessful first military attack on the Nicaraguan National Guard. "In November 1926 the name of Augusto C. Sandino sounded for the first time in Nicaragua," writes Gustavo Alemán Bolaños (1934: 3). Until that year, documentation of Sandino's existence is extremely sketchy to non-existent. Information about his life prior to 1926 is provided by Sandino in later years as he looks backward in interviews and in written correspondence. The story that Sandino tells about himself provides a foundation for his legend and charismatic status but also a peek into his image of himself.

Sandino on His Childhood and Youth

"I opened my eyes in misery and grew up in misery," remembers Sandino (Román, 1979: 36). Virtually all of his recollections of childhood are cast in tragic, desperate terms. While acknowledging his father's financial success and nobility as well as his "markedly indohispanic" roots, Sandino also always identifies his mother, Margarita Calderón, as an employee of the Sandino family and his own status as a "love child and a bastard according to social convention" (Román, 1979: 36). Sandino leaves the impression that, until he was eleven years old, Gregorio Sandino apparently ignored his son, and Augusto lived with his mother under desperate conditions. He recalls,

"...there were...many days...that I had to go out at night to steal...to keep [my mother] from dying from hunger" (Román, 1979: 37).[13]

The importance of Sandino's stories of his early childhood – "the great tragedy of my life" - seems to be that he can use them to mark a decisive turning point for himself on his path to being a revolutionary (Roman, 1979: 37). He tells a story of being jailed with his mother due to her financial debt. She was pregnant at the time, and "the anger and brutal mistreatment caused a miscarriage that brought a copious hemorrhage, almost deadly. And it was up to me only to help her...I was nine years old" (Román,, 1979: 37). This experience leads to some bitterness about the contrast of his miserable situation with that of his half brother, Socrates, who lives comfortably in their father's house. He confronts his father at eleven years old, and his father takes him in and allows Augusto to help in his business.[14]

Sandino is reconstructing his childhood in a way that makes sense of his revolutionary determination and activities. He tells the preceding stories of his childhood to interviewers or in letters after he is well-known for his revolutionary activities. As stated previously, these stories serve to identify a turning point for him with regard to his revolutionary thinking. He successfully casts himself as a tragic figure - due to no fault of his own - who turns tragedy to fierce determination. The enormous suffering and injustice of his youth cause him to transform into a resolute, defiant, and enormously hard-working young man with a keen sense of justice. In charismatic terms, he

[13] Other sources say that Gregorio Sandino did provide some financial support during those earliest years (Macaulay, 1985).
[14] At this time, Augusto begins to call himself Sandino rather than Calderón.

characterizes his beginnings outside the status quo by calling them humble, shameful, and poor and by calling himself a bastard. He also pinpoints a moment in time when he just begins to formulate a mission for himself as he rejects the injustices of that period.

The next turning point, identified by Sandino as "an incident of great transcendence in my life," was the occasion that led Sandino to leave Nicaragua (Román, 1979: 47). The story that he tells Román is that a rumor had begun that the betrothed Sandino was seeing another woman. Accused, insulted and assaulted by the other woman's brother, Sandino shoots the man in the leg. He quickly leaves Niquinohomo to avoid punishment.[15]

Sandino on His Political Awakening

After leaving Nicaragua in 1920, Sandino is on his way to, perhaps, the most significant turning point of his life - his experiences with oilfield workers in Mexico. Accounts vary about exactly where Sandino went after the shooting in Niquinohomo, but

[15] Other sources say that Sandino actually killed the man, and the reasons mentioned for the shooting do not always match what Sandino told Román (Maraboto, 1980; Alemán, 1932; Selser, 1981). There are discrepancies in claims of when Sandino first left Nicaragua. Maraboto (1920) says that Sandino left Nicaragua when he was 16 years old, which would have been 1911-12. He continues that Sandino traveled to Panamá, Mexico, the United States, back to Mexico, to Guatemala and then again to the US. He says that Sandino learned English in the United States "and in Mexico he learned the doctrines of revolution" (Maraboto, 1980: 8). Curiously, this itinerary, particularly the stay in the United States, does not appear in other first-hand accounts such as Román, Alemán, or Beals. Even more curiously, Sandino (1981a: 69) himself, in a letter to his foreign representative in 1928, claims that "at twelve years old, I left my parents and went in search of adventure." He says that he traveled to the major cities of Central and North America but spent the most time in Mexico and may have returned to Nicaragua at age 12. It is generally agreed that he left Nicaragua at age 25 after shooting the man in Niquinohomo. Carlos Fonseca (1984: 7) takes Sandino's word in his brief biography of Sandino, *Sandino, Guerrillero Proletario*, saying that Sandino left Nicaragua in 1912 and traveled to various countries including the US and Mexico.

all agree that he spent time in Honduras and then Guatemala, working for US companies in both countries. While in Honduras, reports Alemán (1932), Sandino had to take the law into his own hands to capture a criminal that local law enforcement did not have the manpower to pursue. Leaving Honduras, Sandino goes to Mexico where he finds a job and also becomes a member of the Masonic order. Eventually, Sandino arrives in the Mexican oilfields and takes a job with Huasteca Petroleum Company (a US interest) in Tampico. It is there that Sandino again notes that he experienced another "transcendental" incident.

Sandino tells two versions of this incident. In a 1926 version, Sandino explains that he had surrounded himself with spiritualist friends. This group would discuss Latin American submission to Yankee imperialism. One day, Sandino tells his friends that if he could find 100 men who love Nicaragua as much as he does, they could restore Nicaragua's sovereignty. In 1933 Sandino tells another story to José Román (1979: 50):

> It was the beginning of 1926 and the first revolutionary movement was just beginning on the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua...One night...reading with some friends the cables of the daily press, I expressed certain wishes of returning to Nicaragua to fight for my party...but a Mexican that was drinking liquor said to me:
> 'No, friend, you're not leaving. Nicaraguans are all a bunch of sellouts...'
> ...that phrase danced in my head all night...even though it was a drunk who said it, it was my fault and all Nicaraguans' lack of patriotism. And in truth, through the fault of the Bryan-Chamorro treaty, they call us Nicaraguans everywhere sellouts.

According to Sandino, his sense of shame resulting from this incident moves him to return at once to Nicaragua. "Without a firm idea...swept away by a magnetic force, blind and irresistible...," says Sandino, he leaves Mexico and arrives in Nicaragua (Román, 1979: 50). He gets a job in the San Albino gold mines (also a US company)

and begins political work among the miners. There, he says that he is appalled by the company's failure to pay workers in currency but with a coupon system of payment that workers must use in company stores. Sandino then begins his newly accepted mission of liberating Nicaraguans from the exploitation of "capitalists and the large foreign businesses..." (Román, 1979: 49). He explains to the miners how systems more favorable to workers function in other countries and insists that they should receive benefits such as medical care and should be able to form workers' unions. "Little by little I was gaining popularity and control among the men of the mine, among them some that followed me faithfully..." (Román, 1979: 49). Sandino's influence among these miners had grown sufficiently enough that he is able to use $3000 of his own savings to buy arms in Honduras and lead twenty-nine of the men into battle against 200 of Chamorro's soldiers (Sandino, 1981a; Maraboto, 1929; Alemán, 1932; Román, 1979).[16] This battle is the moment in which Alemán said that Sandino's name first sounded in Nicaragua.

The workers at the San Albino mine understood that Sandino was not just another Nicaraguan joining the Liberal revolution. They understood that he was indeed on a mission. A follower from those early days, Domingo Pérez, says, "Many joined the fight because of hatred...Sandino rose up in arms because we knew that the conservatives had sold themselves" (Instituto de Estudio del Sandinismo, 1986: 29). Another early follower identifies Sandino's undisputed leadership, "It was from there [San Albino]

[16] Sandino states in an interview that he had $3000.00 while Maraboto and Alemán both report that it was $300.00. Sandino endorsed Maraboto's publication as true except for two errors - one relating to Sandino'half brother, Socrates, and one about Aldolfo Díaz.

where our rebellion set out and it was when we revolted, with Sandino at the head" (Instituto de Estudio del Sandinismo, 1986: 30). Colonel Juan Colindres told Carleton Beals (1928c: 261), "I worked alongside Sandino in the San Albino mines in Nueva Segovia some years ago...even then Sandino had ideas about freeing his fatherland from foreign control."

Sandino and his twenty-nine men lose this first battle at El Jícaro. "Sandino himself confesses the defeat. But he was not disheartened by that setback," says Alemán (1932: 7). His men are discouraged by the failed attack and began to disband, so Sandino goes to join forces with the Constitutionalist Liberal government, politically headed by Juan Bautista Sacasa and headquartered in the Atlantic coastal town of Puerto Cabezas. There, Sandino's request for war materiel is denied by Sacasa and his Minister of War, José María Moncada. So, "Sandino embarked in a primitive canoe..." even while Sacasa receives several tons of munitions and other equipment from Mexico (Alemán, 1932: 8).

Moncada leaves Puerto Cabezas and heads for another battle while Sandino remains in Puerto Cabezas arguing for his own command. Meanwhile, the US navy lands there and orders Sacasa and his supporters to vacate the town, which they do in such a hurry that they leaves many of their munitions. Sandino and six of his men, along with some local prostitutes, collects the arms for themselves. Once again, he seeks out Moncada and asks for a command and, once again, is denied (Maraboto, 1929; Macaulay, 1985). These first experiences with Moncada leave Sandino bitter toward him - a feeling that probably leads to the great mistrust Sandino continues to harbor against Moncada. Regardless of Moncada's personal lack of appreciation for Sandino's offers to fight,

others in the Liberal hierarchy argues that he be given a command, and Moncada finally acquiesces (Macaulay, 1985).

Sandino's forces win two hard-fought battles - including a battle at Jinotega in March - and then, with two other generals, move to aid Moncada, who had been stopped by Conservative troops. Once Moncada's situation improves, he orders Sandino to a Conservative troop stronghold. Sandino apparently believes that Moncada's purpose is to ensure Sandino's defeat and probable death in battle. It seems that Moncada may have been jealous. After Sandino wins the battle at Jinotega, many soldiers wants to transfer to his column. "Moncada read the order of the day, prohibiting the transfer of soldiers from one column to another, as prevention of a great part of the Liberal army...that was wanting to belong to my Segovian column," says Sandino (Alemán, 1932: 13).

Not long after the above incident, Moncada meets with US Marine Captain Frisbie and then with Henry Stimson and Adolfo Díaz (Román, 1979). He signs the peace agreement with Stimson at Tipitapa on May 4, 1927 and tells Sandino of the terms of this agreement the next day. Moncada asks Sandino and his other generals to lay down their arms in exchange for some political concessions from the US to the Liberals, for US supervised elections and for some material and political reward to individuals, including Sandino. Sandino is suspicious but says he will consider the terms. By May 12, all Liberal generals but Sandino had accepts the Tipitapa terms, and Sandino informs Moncada on May 24 that he will not surrender. "I will not sell myself, nor will I surrender. I must be conquered," Sandino tells him and dares Moncada to come disarm him (Sandino, 1990: 79). That same day, Sandino signs a letter to the Marine commander saying that he proposes that the US provide a military governor who will

supervise a presidential election. Years later, he tells José Román about the frustration he felt that day. So much property and so many lives had been destroyed, he recalls thinking, "And for what? In order to again bring the North American Marines to trample down Nicaragua? NO! NO! I SAID TO MYSELF! NO; WHILE SANDINO LIVES, THERE WILL BE SOMEONE TO PROTEST!" (Román, 1979: 66) [Román's emphasis].

Sandino on His Struggle

Thus begins Sandino's armed struggle against US intervention and against the Nicaraguans, including Moncada, who supported it. Alemán (1932: 19) writes, "Sandino is the thunderbolt that descends, he is the gunpowder that explodes, he is simply the punishment for the greed that has been developing in Nicaragua like a leper." Sandino will view himself, and his followers will come to view him, as Nicaragua's great hope for national pride and self-determination as he fights to defeat the Yankee invader.

Of course, Sandino is obliged to inform his troops of Moncada's agreement with Stimson and of his own plans to continue fighting. Luisa Cano Aráuz tells of how Sandino asks the soldiers to raise their hands if they will continue with him (Instituto de Estudio del Sandinismo, 1986). Many say they will continue to follow him, but many say they will not, and he returns to his base with a small group. On the other hand, those who follow were extremely faithful as illustrated by Tomás Jarquín Velázquez, "General Sandino was the guide and we are the heritage; whatever he said, we approved" because Moncada's selling of Nicaragua so enraged Sandino and many of his men (Instituto de Estudio del Sandinismo, 1986: 65).

After Sandino breaks with Moncada and launches his own revolution, he begins to speak to the Nicaraguan public, North Americans and Latin Americans with his own voice. Therefore, it is not until July 1927 that Sandino begins to publicly present a construction of himself. Throughout the coming years as revolutionary leader, he attributes characteristics of charisma to himself. Most importantly, though, Sandino's presentation of self includes as he presents himself as a nationalist, as an historical answer to a historical problem, and finally, as a divine instrument of justice.

Only a few weeks after breaking with Moncada, Sandino issues two manifestos - one on July 1 and the other in mid-July. In each of them, Sandino casts negative images of his opponents as he expresses disgust with United States' financial grip on Nicaragua and links Moncada to those US interests. He then establishes himself as a patriot and describes himself as a man of humble roots - one of the common people. For Sandino, the United States is the "dastardly invader," and the Marines are "morphine addicts" and "miserable servant[s] of Wall Street" (Sandino, 1990: 75). In his statements about US financial interests, Sandino specifically names the owner of the San Albino mine as a man who commits labor abuses and "thinks himself authorized by his nationality to commit such abuses" (Sandino, 1981a: 124). Moncada receives biting criticism from Sandino as a Nicaraguan who "naturally failed in his duties as a soldier and a patriot" and who does not understand the plight of the working people of Nicaragua because he is accustomed to privilege (Sandino, 1988: 49).

Perhaps most importantly, Sandino establishes his identity as a common Nicaraguan who selflessly loves his country. The manifestos not only sketch a

nationalistic identity but claim that his common roots justify his struggle and leadership. In his manifesto of 1 July 1927, he writes:

> I am a Nicaraguan and proud that American Indian blood, more than any other, flows through my veins, for it contains the mystery of loyal and sincere patriotism. The bond of nationality gives me the right to assume responsibility for my actions in matters regarding Nicaragua, and hence Central America and the entire continent of our language, unconcerned that the pessimists and cowards call me whatever name best suits their character as eunuchs (Sandino, 1988: 48).

Two weeks later, the next manifesto emphasizes those themes and adds that his cause is universal. He is also beginning to reveal charismatic characteristics, such as a lack of interest in financial or political gain and his mission to resolve distress, as he writes:

> I want nothing for myself; I am a mechanic, the sound of my hammer on its anvil echoes at a great distance, and it speaks every language in matters of labor. I aspire to nothing. I desire only the redemption of the working class (Sandino, 1990: 80).

Only two days after the second manifesto is issued, Sandino launches his doomed attack on the Marine garrison at Ocotal. Sandino's attack force consists of about sixty officers and soldiers armed with guns and several hundred peasants armed with machetes. His forces attack an enemy composed of "eight hundred pirates [US soldiers] and two hundred renegades [Nicaraguan National Guardsmen]" (Maraboto, 1929: 14). The attack begins in the early morning hours, long before dawn, and proceeds very much in the favor of the Sandinistas - so much so that Sandino offers the opportunity of surrender to the Marine commander, Captain Hatfield. Of course, Hatfield refuses. Then, at mid-morning, Marine planes appear over Ocotal and machine gun fire rains down on the Sandinistas. By late afternoon, all Sandinistas have either been killed or evacuated the town. When the Sandinistas suffer two more defeats in the next two weeks, Sandino

retreats to his mountain fortress, El Chipote (Macaulay, 1985). Perhaps as a sign of the perception of Sandino as a serious threat, a price of $10,000 is then placed on his head for anyone who delivers him dead or alive (de Belausteguitoitia, 1985).

Sandino's analysis of Ocotal, as told to Román (1979) provides quite a peek into his sense of his own leadership. First, he says that the Yankees only won the battle because of the use of airplanes. Then he notes that somehow he was able to convince his men that "it is a thousand times more preferable to die than to be slaves," and so they followed him into battle[17] (Román, 1979: 72). He is quite pleased as he notes that, until Ocotal, everyone had thought the United States had complete authority in Nicaragua. Even Sandino confesses that he believed he would die as part of the effort to rid Nicaragua of US influence. However, the lessons of Ocotal are, first, to "always stand on the side of honor and justice because that makes one invincible" (Román, 1979: 72). Second, "the invincibility of the American Marines is pure myth" (Román, 1979: 72). Third, the introduction of "military aviation against us introduced an element of surprise" that the Sandinistas will have to avoid. Finally, he came to understand the "immense value of publicity with regard to world opinion" (Román, 1979: 72).

General Sandino makes some crucial decisions following three military defeats - Ocotal and two others. First, he decides that his army must turn to guerrilla warfare as their principal strategy (Macaulay, 1985). Secondly, he and his army formally organize the Army in Defense of the National Sovereignty of Nicaragua (EDSNN). The guidelines for the EDSNN are written and then signed by Sandino and hundreds of his

[17] This quote will be used repeatedly by the contemporary Sandinistas.

followers, who swear that they will die before becoming traitors or surrendering to the proposals of "the invaders oligarchs and traitors..." (Sandino, 1981a: 142). The guidelines speak to the purpose of the Army and outline the required behavior of its soldiers. They also clearly establish Sandino's role as undisputed and charismatic leader. The "Defenders of the National Law of Nicaragua...recognize as their Supreme Commander the patriot General Augusto César Sandino, who, with loyalty and sincerity, has known how to defend with complete self-denial the Nation's honor, as a legitimate Nicaraguan...," and "every order emanating from the Supreme Commander of the Revolution will be obeyed with the highest spirit of discipline..." (Sandino, 1981a: 142). Furthermore, the guidelines establish the relationship between Sandino's charismatic authority and his followers:

> The Army in Defense of the National Sovereignty of Nicaragua, made up of selfless patriots, does not receive a daily wage...it being understood that every truly patriotic Nicaraguan is obliged to defend voluntarily the nation's honor; however, the Supreme Commander of the Revolution commits himself to providing everything that is indispensable to the army in the form of equipment and clothing" (Sandino, 1990: 96).

Sandino then turns his attention to another battle - the battle of Telpaneca - and makes a better showing for his army. Sandino reports, "The attack was a total success" (Sandino, 1990: 106). The Sandinistas not only fight well and inflict significant damage on the Marines and National Guard but put new tactics into practice that will frustrate the enemy's efforts to assess Sandino's strength. The Sandinistas begin to remove their dead from the battlefield immediately so that the Marines can not achieve an accurate count, or even an estimate, of Sandinsta casualties (Macaulay, 1985).

At this same time, Sandino begins to make a focused effort to communicate his purpose to the broader Central American, and even Latin American, population through correspondence with Froylán Turcios, Sandino's official foreign representative of the EDSNN based in Honduras and editor of the periodical *Ariel*.[18] Turcios publishes Sandino's letters and manifestos so that Latin Americans may know about Sandino's "opposition to my country's invaders" and "my obsession to repel with dignity and pride the imposition that...the assassins of weak nations are imposing upon our country..." (Sandino, 1990: 100, 105). On the other hand, Sandino complains to Turcios about apparent Latin American indifference to his struggle. Nevertheless, Sandino exhorts Turcios to tell all that "...there will be no human power to stop Sandino and his army, no gold in the world that will arouse ambition in the hearts of the defenders of the national sovereignty of Nicaragua..." (Sandino, 1990: 144).

Sandino implies above that only divine power may stop him, and in a remarkable letter to one of his colonels, the hint is stronger. In the letter, Sandino criticizes the Liberal party for its compromise at Tipitapa. He then seems to refer to himself when he says, "...he that becomes a redeemer has to die crucified and should imitate Jesus Christ in resignation saying: 'Forgive them Father that they know not what they do'" (Sandino, 1981a: 199).

One of the last documents written by Sandino in 1927 is the "Manifesto to the

[18] Former National Guardsman Domingo Ibarra Grijalva (1973: 34) credits Turcios' efforts on behalf of Sandino as being a flash of "lightening which shone and reverberated over the world." He also says that it did not matter that the President of Honduras silenced *Ariel* in 1928 because Turcios had already planted ideas and "ideas perdure as they germinate and reproduce in the consciences of those who love liberty" (Ibarra, 1973: 34).

Nicaraguan People" that expresses the General's position on the presidential elections to occur in November 1928. Sandino condemns the elections for, at least, two reasons. First, he argues that Juan B. Sacasa is already the constitutionally elected president and should be allowed to fulfill his term. Therefore, any election that occurs before Sacasa completes his term is unconstitutional and will be opposed by the EDSNN. Second, Sandino and his army will oppose the election because it will be organized by the "the conquerors" (the US Marines), and the traitor Moncada is likely to be the presidential candidate (Sandino, 1990: 113).

As the year 1927 comes to a close, Augusto César Sandino has begun to present himself as a charismatic figure, and he begins to hint that he plays a divine role. He has described himself as a nationalist, a patriot and then an internationalist. He has declared himself to be humble, indigenous, a member of the working class and one of the oppressed. He seeks only freedom and justice for Nicaraguans, is willing to fight and sacrifice for his cause, is determined and cannot be stopped, and does none of it for personal gain. Furthermore, he has cast the US military and US business as evil doers bent on exploiting Nicaragua, and the Nicaraguans who collaborate with them, such as Moncada, as traitorous sellouts. The followers who continue with him after Moncada's surrender absolutely see the world as Sandino presents it.

The Pan-American Conference in Havana, Cuba opens the new year of 1928. Representatives of the various governments in the hemisphere are there, including those of Nicaragua's Díaz administration. Not only is the US government represented, but President Coolidge thought it important that he come himself, largely due to the controversy regarding Sandino's fight to oust US Marines from Nicaragua. Sandino

writes to the conference attendees exhorting them to formally protest the presence of the "illegal delegates" of the Díaz government (since Sandino considers Sacasa to be the constitutionally elected president) and to protest the United States' "murder" of Nicaraguans (Sandino, 1990: 158). While outwardly the delegates seem supportive of President Coolidge, the body passes a resolution that states, "No state has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another" (Selser, 1981: 104).

Throughout November and December of 1927, Marines and the National Guard mount various attacks against the Sandinista mountain fortress, El Chipote. By January 1928, the attacks are beginning to take their toll on Sandino's forces. As Sandino (Maraboto, 1980: 17) tells it:

> During sixteen days that we were besieged, we had a daily visit from the pirates' aerial squadrons. At six in the morning the first squadron of four airplanes appeared and started bombing. Of course, we were shooting back at them as well and a lot of birds [planes] were mortally injured. After four hours of shelling, a new squadron relieved the first and continued the fire; until, four hours having passed, another one came. And so it was continuously, without stopping, until night fell.

Sandino also reports that the conditions on El Chipote become so unsanitary with the decomposition of dead horses and other animals that he feared an epidemic. Therefore, the Sandinistas remove their dead, as had become their custom, and replaces the corpses with straw bodies to fool the Marines. The army then abandons El Chipote at night. Apparently, the Marines are completely fooled for they continue the bombardment for two days after the Sandinistas had evacuated (Maraboto, 1980).

Sandino leaves El Chipote and goes to San Rafael del Norte, which he is easily able to occupy since the Marines had left it unguarded to attack Sandino's mountain fortress At San Rafael del Norte, Sandino receives Carleton Beals, reporter for the North

American publication, The Nation. Beals arranges the meeting through Froylán Turcios and is the first American to be granted an interview by Sandino. Since Beals' series of articles is published in the United States and not in Nicaragua and contributes to the North American construction of Sandino, they will be discussed in the next chapter. However, Sandino's presentation of himself in this four and one-half hour interview is certainly worth mention here.

General Sandino repeats to Beals statements that he has made before. He demands that the Marines leave Nicaragua, that an impartial civilian president head the Nicaraguan government and that Latin Americans supervise the coming elections. He repeats that he will not accept a government position, a salary, a pension or any other personal reward. He tells Beals that he is an honest man, keeps his word and is debt free.

Beals notes that Sandino refers to God often. "There is a religious note in his thinking," says Beals (1928d: 289) as the General tends to sprinkle his speech with references such as "'God and our mountains fight for us.'" Furthermore, he is firm about not fearing death. "'Death is but a tiny moment of discomfort not to be taken seriously,'" is a phrase that he often repeats to his soldiers (Beals, 1928d: 289).

Lastly, Sandino talks to Beals about the Sandinista mission. He explains that the Sandinistas fight because they are the only Nicaraguans who love their country; the others have betrayed it and are cowards. His army is one of workers and peasants while the intellectuals are the traitors. He is working for all Nicaraguans, and all Central America is morally obliged to help him throw out the invaders. "...eighteen years of American meddling in Nicaragua have plunged the country deeper into economic misery," says Sandino (Beals, 1928f: 341). Beals' (1928f: 341) article concludes with

Sandino explaining, "...sooner or later, every nation, however weak, achieves freedom and that every abuse of power hastens the destruction of the one who wields it."

The image of Sandino presented in his interview with Carleton Beals is that he is friendly, honest, trustworthy, and spiritual. From his followers, he demands complete loyalty, order and discipline, and he is quite proud of them. He is selfless in his love of Nicaragua and is thoroughly committed to freeing Nicaragua from Yankee meddling. Sandino also sees his struggle as obviously morally correct.

In the latter part of March 1928, Sandino's forces move eastward and seize, first, the La Luz and Los Angeles gold mines and, later, the Bonanza mine. All are owned by North Americans. These seizures occur amidst reports in the United States that Sandino has been killed on El Chipote. There is some symbolic meaning for Sandino in seizing the mines since President Díaz had worked at the La Luz and Los Angeles company, and former US Secretary of State, Philander Knox apparently had financial interests in the company. The Sandinistas sack and destroy the mines. As Sandino reports it:

> Of course, receipts were issued to [Knox and Díaz] that I sent to the damned ones in order that they charge the Treasury of the United States, for this reason: 'SO THAT THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES KNOW THAT YOUR MARINES ARE INCOMPETENT TO GUARANTEE THE LIVES AND PROPERTIES OF THE NORTHAMERICANS IN NICARAGUA" (Román, 1979: 92). [Román's emphasis]

Sandino then sends a letter to the manager of the mine explaining that the mines have been destroyed and that North American lives and property will be in danger until the Marines leave Nicaragua. He further explains that the US government's reason for the Marine occupation, to protect US lives and property, is only a pretext for imperialistic interests since Sandino has obviously proven that the Marines are ineffective at their

stated purpose. Sandino also suggests that the manager collect damages from President Coolidge (Sandino, 1990: 192). Maraboto (1980: 18) quotes Sandino as saying, "the Yankees charge us several million, that's fine...they owe us for their stay in the homeland, for the lives that the invasion has cost and other damages, a billion."

At this time, Sandino is beginning to clearly understand himself as an historical agent and to present himself as such. "...I have accepted the unjustified challenge [of the Yankees] that strikes our sovereignty to the ground, ascribing to my acts responsibility before History," he writes to Froylán Turcios (Sandino, 1981a: 70). He takes this responsibility because he loves justice and is willing to sacrifice himself for it as he does not value the material world but the spiritual. The General continues, "To remain inactive or indifferent, as the majority of my fellow citizens, would be to join the rude crowd of mercenary assassins of their own country" (Sandino, 1990: 26).

While Sandino is fighting various battles, he is also mindful to garner support among Latin Americans generally. Numerous letters to Froylán Turcios, which will later be published in *Ariel*, exhort Central Americans and Latin Americans to join together against Yankee imperialism across the Americas and, specifically, in Nicaragua. In a June 1928 letter, he argues that North Americans use the Monroe Doctrine to say 'America for the Americans,' but they really mean 'America for the Yankees.' "All right then," Sandino submits, "so that the blond beasts don't continue to be deceived, I will re-write the sentence in the following terms: *The United States of North America for the Yankees. Latin America for the Indo-Latins*" (Sandino, 1981a: 271). He further writes to Turcios, "...the Yankees can come to our Latin America as guests, but never as lords and masters...It will not be strange if I and my army are found in any Latin American

country where the murderous invader treads in a posture of conquest" (Sandino, 1981a: 271). He ends this particular letter with a phrase that has become one of his most famous statements: "Sandino is Indo-Hispanic and he has no frontiers in Latin America" (Sandino, 1981a: 271).

Sandino's Followers

News of Sandino's revolution and his own efforts to garner support are bearing some fruit. He is receiving vocal support, and sometimes material and financial support, from various quarters. He has supporters in Costa Rica, Mexico, Venezuela and Peru. Gabriela Mistral, the Chilean poet, urges widespread Latin American support of Sandino's struggle and said, "General Sandino bears on his vigorous shoulders of a rustic man...the honor of all of us" (IES, 1985: 213). Anti-imperialist troops in China carry a poster of Sandino and name one of their divisions after him (Macaulay, 1985). At home, his soldiers are becoming more loyal to him and to his cause.

Sandino is the source of rules and discipline in his army, as are charismatic leaders. For example, Sandino issues a decree to his troops outlining policy on the procurement, ownership and treatment of animals. It seems that some Sandinistas were stealing animals thus giving foundation to the bandit label, and Sandino put a stop to it. Neither would Sandino tolerate any of his men stealing, molesting or raping women, or drinking. A Sandinista officer, previously in very good standing, became drunk and raped a woman. He is immediately executed on Sandino's orders (Maraboto, 1980). When the writer de Belausteguigoitia asks Sandino how many executions Sandino has ordered, he answers five. "Two generals, one captain, a sergeant, and a soldier," he responds (de Belausteguigoitia, 1934: 189).

On the other hand, Sandino's soldiers are very devoted to him and are likely to sing his praises, sometimes quite literally. There are several songs and poems of the period that tell of the Nicaraguan struggle against the Yankee invaders or pirates, as Sandino calls them. A portion of the last verse of the *Hymn of the Army* is one example:

> Here are the warriors...
> Nicaragua, Nicaragua...
> that are going to liberate you,
> because it has been your destiny
> that Augusto César Sandino
> take us on the road
> where we are going to triumph.
> (Instituto de Estudio del Sandinismo, 1985a: 139)

Verses from two other songs reinforce the point:

> Long live the patriot, gentlemen,
> That always joyfully fights;
> With pride he has confronted
> The ambitious Gringo
> (Composer unknown, de Belausteguigoitia, 1934: 164)

> We were powerful weapons
> In order to follow the destiny
> That Augusto César Sandino
> Taught us to defend
> (Composer unknown, de Belausteguigoitia, 1934: 166)

Sofonias Salvatierra (1934: 133), who later becomes President Sacasa's Minister of Agriculture and Labor, reports as well that when visiting Sandino's encampment, "Sandino's people were talking and singing since dawn and repeated without ceasing 'Long live General Sandino...'"

De Belausteguigoitia (1934) marvels at the devotion of Sandino's army. He describes the army as lacking proper food and clothing and as not being paid anything. Yet, he sees an army with "spiritual power so great" that it is the most powerful army in

all America as it follows Sandino (de Belausteguigoitia, 1934: 133). Even National Guardsmen recognize that Sandino's men love him. Ibarra (1973: 121) writes, "These men were loyal, as faithful dogs to their master. They sincerely loved the Supreme Chief and Sandino repaid them with his affection and trust."

One of Sandino's officers, Colonel Santos López, will eventually become a founder of the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional. He will write his story well after Sandino's struggle. However, it is appropriate to mention here that López entered Sandino's army at the age of twelve. He became a member of the Coro de los Ángeles (Choir of Angels), a group of children whose job it was to use cans, sticks and other such items to make a racket in order to startle an enemy patrol so that the Sandinistas could attack it. López says that he volunteered for the Sandinsta army, apparently, because he was attracted to the soldiers, and it seemed that it was an alternative to the near starvation that he was enduring with his single mother and siblings. In addition, López noticed that there were other children his age in Sandino's army. He had not yet met Sandino when he joined the army. Throughout López' book, it is clear that he has great respect and admiration for Sandino and great disdain for the Marines, noting their cruelty against "defenseless peasants" such as putting women and children in their homes and then burning the homes (López, no date: 21). However, he does not write about Sandino in charismatic terms, but simply recounts events and conversations.

An abundant collection of followers' quotes edited by the Instituto de Estudio del Sandinismo (IES - Institute for the Study of Sandinism) (1985, 1986) illustrate the previous comments well. Numerous quotes describe Sandino's physical appearance, and almost every one mentions that he was short, about five foot five. They also mention that

he was slender, clean-shaven, rather unremarkable in terms of attractiveness, very clean and well groomed and meticulously dressed with boots always polished and a large Stetson slightly tilted to his forehead. Most focus on the type of man that he was and regularly begin with the observation that he was very kind. For example, one soldier said, "But dealing with him was as if one were dealing with your father" (IES, 1986: 278). Another soldier added,

> General Sandino was a man that exceedingly treated us with every affection, with every kindness and for that reason we all followed him, because he was a very generous man (IES, 1986: 280).

Such comments continue for pages and pages in the collection. Another type of comment speaks to how Sandino personalized his leadership and mission. He was leader and family at the same time as evidenced by one soldier, "When one of us was killed, he felt it as if a son or brother of his had fallen. Sandino said that he felt the loss of a soldier in his heart" (IES, 1986: 278). Similarly, another said, "General Sandino came around to all the reserve corps every morning; he greeted each one, embraced us, because he was a very popular man with everyone" (IES, 1986: 283). Yet, the mission was always clear: "He was always explaining to us that his struggle was to get the Yankees out of Nicaragua, because the Yankees are not the owners of Nicaragua" (IES, 1986: 282).

Such commitment is not limited to Sandino's army. Pavletich (1983) relates the story of a seven-year-old boy who hid himself, terrified upon hearing that General Sandino was coming to town. By dusk, the boy was giving rapt attention to Sandino's explanation of Yankee imperialism. When Sandino and his men left town the next day, the boy was yelling, "Long live General Sandino!"

In addition, his soldiers sense a presence or power in Sandino greater than the man himself. In various ways, their comments indicate that Sandino was either a historical force of a divine instrument. Their observations include:

> There was the influence of Bolívar in Sandino in the continental sense, because Bolívar wanted to unite all the American states, including the North Americans, against Europe...The plan to realize the Supreme Dream of Bolívar, Sandino wanted to execute an agreement with the rest of the Indohispanic, Latin American governments, to confront North American imperialism (IES, 1986: 287).
>
> Sandino, now, is listening to me in immortality; to me he is like a demi-god (IES, 1986: 288)
>
> General Sandino was every hope for Nicaragua, complete guardian of national sovereignty. General Sandino has not died, he will live eternally in the heart of those who knew him and worked with him, because we knew who he was and we value him as a great hero (IES, 1986: 288).

Sandino Abroad

General Moncada is elected to the presidency on November 4, 1928. With Moncada's election, the United States government begins to believe that Sandino's days are numbered. The US military begins to withdraw those troops deployed to supervise the election. The Sandinistas had tried to disrupt the elections for the previous month, but it seems that enough Nicaraguans turned out to vote that non-Sandinistas consider the election legitimate. Additionally, Sandino had suggested that the elections be supervised by Latin Americans, an idea clearly rejected (Macaulay, 1985).

The election of Moncada, a traitor in Sandino's eyes, is problem enough in itself. Another problem arises when Sandino's principal foreign representative begins to disagree with Sandino's plans. Froylán Turcios writes to Sandino in late November asking that he issue a manifesto that he will lay down his arms as soon as the Marines

leave Nicaragua. Turcios believes that Sandino should not demand the removal of Moncada whether Moncada is a traitor or not. To do otherwise, for Turcios, would amount to civil war rather than a war against Yankee imperialism (Maraboto, 1980; Macaulay, 1961; Hodges, 1990). Sandino responds that he disagrees with Turcios' proposal because following Turcios' advice would mean that Sandino recognizes the Moncada government and the elections as legitimate, which he does not. He further implies that issuing the manifesto that Turcios suggests would be lazy and would cede the moral authority that he has accumulated (Maraboto, 1980). By late December 1928, Turcios resigns over what he sees as impasse with Sandino, and Sandino accepts his resignation in January 1929 (Sandino, 1981a).

The year 1929 begins with Sandino rejecting a proposal made by US Admiral Sellars that Sandino surrender. Sandino writes to Moncada on New Year's Day providing Moncada with a copy of the letter to Sellars and informing him that Sandino will only discuss peace with Moncada himself because Nicaraguan peace must be achieved by Nicaraguans. Five days later Sandino issues "Fundamental Principles of an Agreement Proposed to General José María Moncada." The purpose of the principles is to offer Moncada the chance to make himself accountable to the Nicaraguan people. Contained within the first thirteen of fifteen principles are two essential messages. First, the US government is to not only remove its occupation forces from Nicaragua, but Moncada's administration will reject any future efforts by the US to usurp Nicaraguan sovereignty whether through political or economic means and will nullify the Bryan-Chamorro treaty. Second, the Nicaraguan government must initiate certain social and economic programs that benefit average citizens. These programs include worker's

compensation, eight-hour work days, paying workers in cash rather than coupons, employers providing schools, equal pay for women, regulation of child labor, the right to organize unions and the establishment of a national department of labor. Point Fourteen then insists that Nicaragua lead in the formation of a Central American union, and Point Fifteen requires that guarantees be made to the people of the four departments where the EDSNN has been most active (Sandino, 1990). Maraboto (1980) reports that Moncada did not consider these proposals and had not responded to them by July 15.

The early part of the year brings some significant changes for Sandino. Upon the previously mentioned resignation of his chief foreign representative, Sandino decides to act as his own foreign representative and visit the President of Mexico. Toward this end, he appoints Juan de Paredes, a captain in the EDSNN, as his special envoy to Mexico. Dr. Pedro José Zepeda, a Nicaraguan living in Mexico City, had already long been Sandino's representative in Mexico and had worked in concert with Turcios in communicating Sandino's messages to the world. De Paredes and Zepeda are to prepare the way for Sandino's visit (Macaulay, 1985).

Other changes involve the nature of the war that is always raging while Sandino writes and makes plans in addition to overseeing battles. In February Sandino's chief of staff, General Girón, is captured by Marines, turned over to Nicaragua's new volunteer army, and then executed after a trial. In addition, the new US president, Herbert Hoover, is inaugurated and wants to evacuate the Marines from Nicaragua and Haiti. On March 6, 1929, Sandino sends a lengthy open letter to Hoover. First, he informs Hoover that it is due to the efforts of the Sandinistas that Coolidge and Secretary of State Kellogg have been removed from office. He then puts Hoover on notice that the Sandinistas are

prepared to "punish implacably every abuse of the United States of America in the affairs of our country" (Sandino, 1990: 239). Sandino links the dollars of Wall Street bankers to the deaths of Nicaraguan citizens, and he explains that the actions of the Coolidge administration "have produced an enormous wave of hatred and distrust for you..." (Sandino, 1990: 241). Sandino concludes by indicating his charisma and historical influence and continuity: "As long as you continue the policies of Coolidge and Kellogg, you will continue encountering Sandinos" (Sandino, 1990: 242).

Sandino continues to emphasize his struggle for Nicaragua's history. A month after writing to Hoover, Sandino writes to Chilean poetess Gabriela Mistral that he is the one to continue the struggle of General Benjamín Zeledón, killed in 1912 during a Yankee attack. Sandino tells her, "...that fraternal patriot had been the first to lift the stone that, with its great weight, would someday drive the dynamo that would bring the light of freedom to our peoples, and I would carry that stone as far as I could and, even after I had fallen in battle, others would come to carry it wherever it had to be taken" (Sandino, 1990: 63). Sandino, in the course of his revolutionary career, will refer many times to his sense of place in Nicaraguan history and that, just as he is a link in this chain, others will continue his historical work as well.

Sandino departs Nicaragua for Mexico in May 1929. Before leaving, he issues his "Plan for the Realization of Bolivar's Highest Dream" on behalf of the Army in Defense of the National Sovereignty of Nicaragua. The forty-four point plan invokes Bolivar's image and argues for an alliance of the twenty-one Latin American nations to stand against the imperialism of the United States and to establish their own pan-Latin American governing bodies such as a Congress and a Court of Justice. The alliance

would also have its own armed forces. Throughout the document, he mentions the need to forge a Latin American nationality "thereby assuring our domestic freedom and independence, now threatened by the most voracious of all imperialisms, to fulfill in time the great destiny of the Latin American nationality...as a land of promise for people of every nation and race" (Sandino 1990: 262).

Sandino arrives in Mexico on June 25 expecting, based on information given him by the Sandinista envoy de Paredes, that Mexico's president Portes Gil will provide him with aid in finances and materiel. When Sandino enters Mexico, he is met with great fanfare but is asked to wait in Veracruz until he receives word calling him to Mexico City. Word does not come, and he is invited to stay in a house on the Yucatán peninsula that is provided by the Mexican government. After months of waiting to be called to the capital, Sandino suspects de Paredes of treachery and fires him. Otherwise, Sandino has comparatively little to do in Mexico. In July Sandino grants an interview to Emigidio Maraboto, a Mexican journalist who interviews him in Veracruz (Macaulay, 1985).

Maraboto's work, cited elsewhere in this chapter, is a booklet called Sandino ante el coloso (Sandino Before the Colossus) and is one of the most notable documents of Sandino's time. The booklet is notable because it is one of the first lengthy, published studies of Sandino and is written and published in 1929 during the first half of Sandino's struggle and while Sandino is still alive. Maraboto, a Mexican journalist, writes the piece while Sandino is in Mexico for the purpose of informing the world of the situation in Nicaragua. The book claims to present the true image of Sandino against the image of a bandit as presented by the United States press. While the book is not a formal interview with Sandino, Sandino himself confirms the authenticity of the document and that, except

for two errors, it contains correct information[19] (Maraboto, 1980). Therefore, Maraboto's work does, in some sense, convey Sandino's image of himself. The Sandino presented in this work is strong-willed, driven, principled, unschooled but intelligent, successful and democratically-minded. As mentioned previously, it is also one of the few sources that gives Sandino's version of his childhood and youth.

The striking title of the book - Sandino ante el coloso - casts Sandino in mythic and biblical terms in the tradition of David and Goliath. Most of the references to Sandino in this booklet include adjectives which portray him as a charming, intelligent, and determined warrior. However, it also includes other glowing comments that link him to the divine. For example, "destiny reserved for him [Sandino] the role of supreme commander of the Army for the Defense of the National Sovereignty of Nicaragua" (Maraboto, 1980: 9). Similarly, the booklet reprints a letter to Sandino from a Honduran journalist and representative of Sandino. The journalist writes to Sandino that "your honor and glory will remain immortalized in the highest civic conscience and in freedom" (Maraboto, 1980: 21). This comment does not directly attribute divinity to Sandino, but it is strikingly similar to a word of praise that might be uttered in a religious context.

Maraboto is clearly impressed by Sandino and declares, "Augusto César Sandino is not the man that everyone imagines" (Maraboto, 1980: 8). It is unclear what Maraboto believes the public image of Sandino is, but he argues against it by describing the General as "...an improvised warrior, but every bit a warrior," "a humble, ignorant

[19] According to Sandino, the two errors are "that of saying that Socrates Sandino and I are brothers by father and mother, and that the sellout Díaz is the Minister of Nicaragua in Washington...Outside of those two errors, all the rest is authentic" (Maraboto, 1980: 2).

mechanic," and "a man of little instruction, but of enormous natural intelligence, astute and...nice and pleasant..." (Maraboto 1980: 8). Sandino is also impressed by Maraboto's product. In September Sandino sends a copy of the Sandino ante el coloso to Gustavo Alemán Bolaños recommending it to Alemán as essentially correct.

While Sandino waits in the Yucatán, the Sandinista revolutionaries are suffering their own troubles. General Pedro Altamirano is commanding largely because a handful of other generals did not want the job. The Sandinistas are winning the occasional victory, but there is a general demoralization among the troops with the absence of their charismatic leader. Battles are also less numerous since it has become the primary task of the Marines to train the National Guard. Additionally, the Marines have largely taken responsibility for policing the cities while the Guard patrols the countryside. As mentioned previously, Hoover was not fond of the war in Nicaragua and training guardsmen to shoulder more of the burden was a way to ease the Marines' responsibility (Macaulay, 1985).

October brings the advent of worldwide economic depression. A few weeks before the stock market crash, October brings a replacement for Turcios as Sandino's chief foreign representative. He appoints Dr. José Zepeda, a Nicaraguan physician living in Mexico City, and mentions that he considered Gustavo Machado for the position. Machado, a Venezuelan, is the head of the Hands Off Nicaragua Committee, headquartered in Mexico City. However, Sandino complains that Machado has not acted responsibly in terms of communicating in a timely fashion or in completing promised work on Sandino's behalf (Sandino, 1990). Then in December, Machado accuses Sandino of accepting and then misspending money from the Mexican Communist party

and of accepting a bribe from the US to leave Nicaragua and go to Mexico. Sandino, of course, has to spend considerable time and diplomatic effort to counter those charges (Macaulay, 1985; Sandino, 1990). The rift will ultimately lead to a parting of the ways between Sandino and the Communists.[20]

Sandino is finally able to go to Mexico City in January 1930 to meet with President Portes Gil. Apparently, the meeting accomplishes more in terms of adding to Sandino's prestige by meeting with a head of state than it did in terms of acquiring tangible help for the Sandinista revolution. Yet Sandino stays in Mexico for a few more months, gives some interviews and continues to try to mend fences with the Communist party even though he does not fully accept their political position (Macaulay, 1985; Hodges, 1986).

During some of those interviews in Mexico, Sandino admits to some unseemly practices of his army while criticizing the immorality of the US government. In one interview, Sandino (1990: 301) calls Coolidge and Kellogg "moral wretches" and yet, in another on the same day, admits that his troops practice the *corte de chaleco* - or "vest cut" - on Yankees. The vest cut is the decapitation of the victim along with cutting off the arms at the shoulders. In his interview with Maraboto (1980: 20), Sandino also mentions that he gives no quarter to prisoners of war - he "loses his prisoners" - out of necessity. On the other hand, he says that he knows it is important to North Americans to recover the remains of the dead so he plans to return the remains of US dead - "who die fighting the cause of bankers" - to their families (Maraboto, 1980: 20).

[20] This break will also include Sandino losing his Salvadoran secretary, Communist Farabundo Martí, who will also become the namesake for the contemporary revolution in El Salvador.

The General recalls a specific incident in his Mexico trip for interviewer Román (1979) in 1933. It reveals Sandino's popularity outside Nicaragua and his own satisfaction with it. Sandino wanted to see a bullfight. He continues, "We arrived, intentionally, in the middle of the first bullfight, in order to not call attention to ourselves. I was dressed as a civilian with dark glasses...but...someone shouted, 'Mexicans, General Sandino is with us in this plaza. Long live General Sandino!' and...the entire plaza stood up shouting 'Viva Sandino!'" Román (1979: 107) says that he talked to a Mexican who was there, and that person confirms Sandino's story and adds that the fight was suspended for several minutes due to the noise and ovation and "hats flew into the ring and it seemed that the whole world had gone crazy."

Return to Nicaragua & Becoming Divine

Sandino writes a remarkable letter to General Altamirano in January 1930. The purpose of this brief letter seems to be encouragement. However, it also contains an extremely noteworthy passage regarding Sandino's view of himself. Sandino (1990: 287) writes,

> "...I am nothing but an instrument of divine justice to redeem this nation, and that if I am in need of some of the miseries existing on this earth it's because I had to come before you also born of a woman and to offer myself to you full of the human miseries common to all of us in this earthly world, because you would not have been able to believe me if I had not spoken and been the same as you."

The comment is more than strikingly similar to the story of Jesus Christ in every aspect except that Sandino is to save a nation and not humankind in general.

In April Sandino leaves Mexico and returns to Nicaragua in May. Just before leaving Mexico, Sandino writes a letter to Estéban Pavletich (member of his staff and

representative of the Peruvian American Popular Revolutionary Alliance) vowing that he will never again leave Nicaragua while the "miserable Yankee invader remains on Nicaraguan soil" (Sandino, 1990: 327). Furthermore, Sandino promises to remain fiercely determined to oust the invader. He (1990: 327) invokes the words of Bolívar, *"If the elements are against us, we will be against the elements, and if God is against us, we will be against God"* [Sandino's emphasis]. In the first months of 1930, Sandino has linked himself to the hero of the Americas, Bolívar, has spoken of himself in Christ-like terms and has expressed a willingness to battle God for the righteousness of his cause.

On June 18 Sandino personally leads four hundred men to take possession of Mount Saraguazca near Jinotega. A battle ensues early on June 19, and Sandino claims that his men have routed the enemy by noon. However, Marine planes arrive and begin bombing and firing machine guns. An enemy bomb explodes, wounding Sandino in his left leg. In mid-August Sandino tells Zepeda that his wound has improved, but the leg is stiff, he walks with a limp, and he uses a cane. He also mentions that the wound has not "had any effect on our moral cause because it will only disappoint those timid people who are in the habit of slandering us" (Sandino, 1990: 349).

During the last three months of 1930 and then through February 1931, the General shares his views on spiritual matters and his firm belief that he and his cause are directly linked to divine will. Sandino sends letters to Abraham Rivera, a Sandinista officer, that speak of "the law of love" (Sandino, 1981b: 145). He explains to Rivera that it is love from which all material substance, known as *ether*, is formed. Ether "is the life demonstrated by electricity, which is the life of mankind, that is to say, all *light* (*the spirit*)" (Sandino, 1981b: 146). Justice also springs from love and, therefore, injustice

occurs when there is ignorance of the divine law of love, and it is contrary to love. In his " 'Light and Truth' Manifesto" Sandino further explains that injustice will disappear from the earth when the "refractory spirits" are "flung upon other planets that are less advanced than the earth" (Sandino, 1981b: 147). The Last Judgment of the world is the destruction of injustice and the Reign of the Spirit of Light and Truth, also called Love. Sandino (1981b: 160) outlines what will happen:

> ...the oppressed people of the earth will break the chains of humiliation, with which the imperialists of the earth have sought to keep them in backwardness. The trumpets that will be heard will be the bugles of war, intoning the hymns of the freedom of the oppressed peoples against the injustice of the oppressors...Love, the kingdom of Perfection, will remain...

He links the Last Judgment to his revolution, "The honor has fallen to us, brothers, that in Nicaragua we are the ones chosen by Divine Justice to begin the judgment of injustice over the earth" (Sandino, 1981b: 160). The "spirits of Light protect our army and the black spirits are those that favor the White House..." and "our cause will triumph because it is the cause of justice, because it is the cause of love," he says (Sandino, 1981b: 162). Sandino further writes that his purpose in sharing these things with Rivera is to convert Rivera and to prove to him that "we are not in this struggle merely by accident, but rather in fulfillment of the law of Justice (*the law of love*)" (Sandino, 1981b: 154). Later, in early 1933, Sandino will tell an interviewer that he and his army are so thoroughly aware of their mission that he can communicate his thoughts to the soldiers very directly:

> "Magnetism of thought is transmitted. The waves flow and are grabbed by those who are disposed to understand them. In combat, with the nervous system in tension, a voice with magnetic feeling has an enormous resonance" (de Belausteguitoitia, 1985: 177).

By the end of 1930, Sandino has significantly changed his presentation of himself from previous years. Previously, he has emphasized that he is indigenous, one of the oppressed and working class. He is Pan-American, Latin American and Indo-Hispanic. Sandino seeks freedom and justice, is willing to fight and sacrifice, and cannot be stopped. His struggle is driven by his patriotism, nationalism and internationalism. The General makes it clear that he does not seek public office, salary or other personal reward, that he loves spiritual rewards and not material ones. Furthermore, he sees himself as representative of the true feelings of his fellow citizens and is in spiritual union with Nicaraguans. However, in late 1930 and early 1931, he is saying that he and his army are all those things and also instruments of divine justice and that they are apparently part of a cosmic plan to usher in a new world.

During the same period that Sandino is outlining his spiritual beliefs to Rivera, Secretary of State Stimson has decided to withdraw all but a few Marines by June 1, 1931 and withdraw the rest after the 1932 elections. However, a terrible earthquake strikes Managua on March 31 killing almost 1,500 people. Sandino sends a message to all of his soldiers that through the earthquake "Divine Justice is herself punishing the enemy" and that his army must finish the job (Somoza García, 1936: 219).

The Yankees Go Home

The EDSNN is launching offensives in early 1931 in spite of Stimson's planned troop withdrawal. Sandino has always clearly stated that he will fight until all US troops are withdrawn from Nicaragua, so Stimson's plan is not sufficient to stop the Sandinista attacks. Sandino's men burn the Bragman's Bluff Lumber Company and raid Standard Fruit Company in mid-April. Tropical Radio is put out of commission by Sandinista

attacks.[21] On April 16 Stimson says that the United States cannot protect Americans and recommends that they depart Nicaragua. Furthermore, Stimson admits that he considers the Marines' work with the National Guard to be a failure. This policy change is a surprise to many Americans but a rather welcome one since the use of Marines to protect American business property in Nicaragua was becoming unpopular in the States (Macaulay, 1985).

Throughout the summer and fall of 1931, the Sandinistas mount various successful raids. However, the EDSNN suffers two blows with the deaths of Sandinista Generals Blandón and Ortéz. On the other hand, Generals Altamirano and Umanzor (who replaces Ortéz) have several successes. Sandinista columns seem to be everywhere, and the guerrilla attacks are well organized. According to Sandino, the army is well organized and disciplined because "it is conscious of its elevated historical role" (Sandino, 1981b: 187). In November, President Hoover reaffirms the plan to pull out the Marines after the elections in 1932.

Sandino launches another manifesto in January 1932 criticizing the form of the elections to be held in November. "What the gringos are seeking is the humiliation of our homeland until they are able to leave," says Sandino (1981b: 213). He elaborates that the Yankees support the Conservative candidates and have even ordered Moncada to make Sacasa the Liberal candidate. In addition, the Marines are to once again supervise the elections. Sandino reminds his followers that the Yankees only want to control them

[21] Interestingly, New York Times reporters tended to file their reports from Managua by way of Tropical Radio. Tropical Radio Telegraph Company incorporated as a subsidiary of United Fruit in 1913. (Wilson, 1947).

and instructs them to frustrate the election process.

Meanwhile, the war continues, and much of Sandino's communications during this time are orders to his generals, battle reports, notices of political activities, and messages meant to inspire and motivate his troops. Sandino also remains steadfast in his resolve not to ally himself with Communists even though they both struggle against the Yankee domination. He makes his position clear to de Belausteguigoitia (1985: 181), "This movement is national and anti-imperialist...this movement is popular and we propose an advanced interpretation of social aspirations," but the movement will not yield to attempts to influence it by various groups, including the Communists, says Sandino.

Most of his communications continue to drive the point that US interference in Nicaragua, the Marine occupation and foreign supervised elections are absolutely unacceptable. A news bulletin released by Sandino (1981a) in May to Indo-hispanics lauds the numerous military victories won by his generals and uses casualty statistics to demonstrate the superiority of Sandinista forces. Nevertheless, the Marines gain some surprise as they introduce the new autogiro - the precursor to the helicopter - into the fight.[22]

The presidential elections occur on November 6, 1932, and Sandino writes to General Altamirano on November 9. "The elections are over already, and we are now waiting to learn whether it is with Sacasa or with the Conservatives that we are to continue our struggle, because no matter who it is, the pirates are leaving on January 2,"

[22] Unfortunately for the Marines, its performance was disappointing (Macaulay, 1985).

Sandino (1990: 416) tells him. The results show Sacasa the winner, and Sandino issues his peace proposals on November 12. The proposals require that the Nicaraguan government seek and obtain the immediate withdrawal of US military forces and accept the support of the Army in Defense of the National Sovereignty of Nicaragua (EDSNN) in maintaining order in the country. The government must also accept and support a pan-American conference that includes not only the twenty-one Latin American nations but also the United States, with Sandino as Nicaragua's representative. Conferees would discuss US business and military interests in Central America and the paternalistic attitude of the US toward Latin America (Sandino, 1990). A few days after Sandino submits his proposals, Anastasio Somoza García is appointed chief of the National Guard by Sacasa. The next month, the Marines begin to leave Nicaragua.

Gustavo Alemán Bolaños, a Nicaraguan journalist and writer, publishes Sandino! Estudio completo del héroe de las Segovias (Sandino! A Complete Study of the Hero of Las Segovias).[23] The booklet presents a very positive picture of Sandino. The General is humble and has the best intentions as exemplified by a quote from one of Sandino's letter to the author, "My good faith, my worker's simplicity, and my patriotic heart..." (Alemán, 1932: 9). The list of Sandino's demands on behalf of workers are included and show that Sandino is sympathetic to their plight. He is popular with his men and, though not formally trained in military sciences, "Sandino has military intuition and...is a soldier

[23] Alemán was an exiled Nicaraguan writer who supported Sandino. He does not interview Sandino for the booklet but relies on documents apparently given to him by Sandinistas between 1929 and 1932 as well as some letters exchanged between him and Sandino. It is originally published in Guatemala and then in Mexico with the title *Sandino, the Liberator* (Snarr, 1989; Ramírez, 1985). In 1945 Alemán will publish a book critical of Somoza entitled *Un Lombrosiano: Somoza 1939-1944*.

by nature" (Alemán, 1932: 21). He is also the right person to challenge the Yankee invader because he accepts this responsibility and because it is his responsibility as a Nicaraguan. However, the most striking description of Sandino and his charisma come not from Sandino but from Alemán. Alemán (1932: 38) compares Sandino to other historical figures as he writes,

> And in Central America there is not enough bronze to cast the figure of Sandino; only going...for that material to the statue of Bolívar, to the statue of Sucre, to the statue of San Martín, to the statue of Hidalgo, to the statue of José Martí, could enough be found to cast the figure of Sandino. Not only through him and no one else is Central America saved from a danger that was hanging over the isthmus...but offered with the pain of a handful of men - the Sandinsta bandits - and of a man that took them to triumph through the road of struggle - Sandino the bandit.

He lauds Sandino as a man who defied and conquered the United States and says, "Whoever will try to deny this truth, that he reread the preceding pages, that he place his hand on his heart and that he lift his eyes toward the effigy cast in bronze of General Augusto César Sandino!" (Alemán, 1932: 81).

In early spring, before the elections, various elite members of the Conservative and Liberal parties begin discussing and forming a plan to end the struggle between Sandino and Nicaraguans who were not Sandinistas. The committee is called the Patriotic Group and appoints Sofonías Salvatierra as their spokesperson. The Patriotic Group develops a plan in which the presidential candidates would pledge, before the elections, to respect the losing party afterward. The candidates agree. In late November Salvatierra writes to Sandino on behalf of the Patriotic Group asking that Sandino enter into talks with a joint commission consisting of Liberals and Conservatives for the purpose of moving toward the "full exercise of sovereignty" (Selser, 1981: 156). He also

commends Sandino for leading the struggle against interventionism and acknowledges that Nicaraguans are ready to adjust and accept their new freedom and are "turning toward you with the open arms of a brother" (Selser, 1981: 157). Sandino closes the year by accepting Salvatierra's proposal (with a few provisos) and appoints as his delegates Salvador Calderón Ramírez, Dr. Escolástico Lara, Dr. Pedro José Zepeda and General Horacio Portocarrero.[24]

Juan B. Sacasa is sworn in as Nicaragua's president on January 1, 1933, and the last Marines leave Nicaragua on January 2. Salvatierra is appointed by the president to head the delegation to negotiate with Sandino. Salvatierra's impression of Sandino is that the General has been in complete command of his troops for seven years and will not tolerate argument but will relax when treated with kindness. Furthermore, Salvatierra is quite impressed by the devotion of Sandino's men to him. He comments that the men have had no clothes, medicine or blankets for years yet have fought on and remained loyal as evidenced by their repeated chants, during the negotiations, of 'Long Live General Sandino!' (Selser, 1981).

Sandino on Peacemaking

Blanca Arauz de Sandino (Sandino's wife) and Salvatierra make the arrangements to bring Sandino and President Sacasa together.[25] On February 2 Sandino arrives in Managua to meet with Sacasa. However, he has some misgivings about the truce as he tells one of his generals that, if by February 5, "there is no news of me, it is a

[24] One of President Sacasa's negotiators is Crisanto Sacasa, the president's brother. Crisanto Sacasa will become Somoza García's Minister of Education.
[25] In fact, Blanca plays a pivotal role in negotiating the truce between the Sandinistas and the National Guard.

sure sign that I am dead" (Sandino, 1981b: 276). He also announces to his troops that he goes to Managua to reach a peaceful understanding with Sacasa but "if Dr. Sacasa decides to have me arrested, I will kill myself, and if I do not do it each of you is authorized to spit in my face as a traitor" (Sandino, 1981b: 277).

Sandino's arrival at the Managua airport was supposed to have been secret, but word somehow spread, and there was a fairly large crowd there to greet the General. According to José Román (1979: 13), who was there and would interview Sandino in a few weeks, "everyone there shouted and were like crazy people." Sandino then gets into the limousine provided by Sacasa, but just then Somoza arrives, and both men step from their cars. Somoza and Sandino embrace, and he invites Sandino to ride into his car, an invitation which Sandino accepts.[26] As the car drives through the streets of Managua, people cheer the General. Late that night, Sandino and President Sacasa sign the peace agreement.

The peace agreement calls for the disarmament of Sandino's troops, except for a 100 man security force, at San Rafael del Norte. The document also makes provisions for aiding Sandino's troops to return to normal lives and become productive members of Nicaraguan society. For example, a large area of uncultivated land is set aside for them, and public works projects will give preferential consideration to Sandino's men with regard to employment. Interestingly, the agreement mentions in its first point that Sandino and his army have served the homeland well and reaffirms that Sandino neither expects nor will he accept any wealth or material advantage that might cast suspicion on

[26] A famous photograph taken of the embrace between Sandino and Somoza is generally used to highlight Somoza's lies and treachery.

his past or present motivation. The second point emphasizes the signers' reverence for and commitment to the Constitution and Nicaraguan law (Sandino, 1990). Sandino (1990: 445) tells a reporter the next day, "I want peace in Nicaragua and I've come to establish it." The Army in Defense of the National Sovereignty of Nicaragua complies with the agreement on February 22, 1933 and lays down its arms.

It is during the month of February and during the disarmament that Sandino grants an interview to Ramón de Belausteguigoitia, a Spanish journalist. From those interviews, de Belausteguigoitia publishes Con Sandino en Nicaragua (With Sandino in Nicaragua) in 1934. In considering only what the author says about Sandino, the work is a very positive presentation of Sandino. The author's assessment is that "Sandino is a man of absolute good faith" (1985: 206). The book presents General Sandino as a nationalist and a link in a historical chain. Of course, as a nationalist, Sandino fought and succeeded on behalf of his beloved Nicaragua. However, de Belausteguigoitia mentions more than once that Sandino is historically linked to Bolivar's war for independence a century earlier. Sandino is "the successor of Bolívar, the new hero of America" and the "fulfillment of Bolívar's program" (de Belausteguitoitia, 1985: 132, 159). Moreover, Sandino is linked to the future. "The work of Sandino has not ended," says de Belausteguitoitia (1985: 139), "but that ordinary force will continue in one form or another. It is an arrow launched to the horizon, endowed with an invincible moral momentum."

Perhaps most importantly, de Belausteguigoitia speaks numerous times of Sandino in charismatic terms. First, he says that his purpose in writing the book is to "take back the great rebel Sandino, that is lifted above the panorama of his people..." (de

Belausteguigoitia, 1985: 37). A soldier in Sandino's army tells the author, "...upon the ending of a rain, [we] saw that over Sandino's head was perched a double rainbow" (de Belausteguigoitia, 1985: 145). De Belausteguitoitia (1985: 171, 178) describes General Sandino as "a man of action and a prophet...he is an extraordinary personality..." and later says, "It is Sandino, the hero and brilliant Sandino, the visionary." The devotion of Sandino's followers is mentioned as well. The author notes that the soldiers are all volunteers and do not get paid but also notes that there is something unique in the discipline of the troops. The discipline seems to spring, not from lectures or threats but that "the strange and profound soul of General Sandino had created in his army a religious sect and had imbued in it the fire of a new revelation," according to de Belausteguigoitia (1985: 130).

There are some more personal details about Sandino noted by the author. "Sandino speaks with a slow, persuasive, precise voice...and at times gives the impression of extracting with anguish the concepts at the bottom of his brain," observes de Belausteguigoitisa (1985: 134). He also mentions that Sandino always uses "we" when speaking and that he, at one and the same time, "expresses youthful happiness" and "pain and worries" (de Belausteguitoitia, 1985: 134). The author finds the General kind and "of a great spiritual height" noting that he practices yoga and is a "disciple of the East" (de Belausteguigoitia, 1985: 170).

All of the above discussion is preceded by de Belausteguigoitia attributing negative values to and casting Nicaraguan politicians as sellouts. Interestingly, he does not focus at all on North Americans except as those to whom the old politicians are beholden. The old politicians have submitted to the Americans due to greed and personal

ambition. Moncada, Chamorro and Díaz, in particular, are culpable. The reason to focus on these Nicaraguans is to then present Sandino in contrast to their selfishness. Sandino appeared to redeem Nicaragua from the submissive state into which the greedy politicians had sold it. Additionally, de Belausteguigoitia (1985: 58) explains why the old politicians hate Sandino so:

> ...the old politicians would never forgive Sandino his consecration as hero of outrageous patriotism.
> Because all those who have helped or have consented to the American penetration see in Sandino...a symbol that reminds them of the duties that they did not fulfill, the patriotic sentiment that they postponed for their individual egos...Sandino is like an accusatory conscience, and because of that there are many of his countrymen who continue calling him, although in a weaker voice, the title of bandolero.

De Belausteguigoitia mentions that the politicians have put Nicaragua in the hands of the American colossus. Therefore, "the appearance of Sandino and his banner of freedom have been necessary to redeem this people and these Republics from the state of servitude into which their politicians have dragged them" (de Belausteguigoitia, 1985: 46).

It is also in February and March of 1933 that José Román, a Nicaraguan journalist, interviews Sandino.[27] The resulting book, Maldito Pais (Damned Country), is one of the longest works recording firsthand experience with Sandino. Román worked as a secretary on behalf of Sacasa's government-in-exile in the Washington DC office and

[27] Román originally conducted his interviews with Sandino in February and March of 1933. However, the book was not published until 1979. According to Román (1979), it was not printed until then because Román had promised Sandino that the book would be published in Nicaragua. Román was finally ready to return to Nicaaragua from New York in February 1934 to publish the book. However, Sandino was murdered about that time, and it became impossible to keep the promise. Instead of breaking his promise and publishing the book in another country, Román waited until the Somozas were defeated. Román assures the reader that he has made no changes in the manuscript except to correct typographical errors.

then as Sacasa's personal secretary. Therefore, Román had the opportunity to see US news coverage of the war in Nicaragua and to hear talk of the war and of Sandino among Americans. He notes that poets like Neruda, Barbusse and Mistral wrote about Sandino. Román also frequented a speakeasy that attracted such artists as Diego Rivera, Edna St. Vincent Millay and the painter Siqueiros. Apparently, one topic of much conversation among these intellectuals was General Augusto Sandino. "The figure of Sandino took on mythological proportions...for the public he was a semi-god of a great, living epic poem," writes Román (1979: 8).[28]

With Sacasa's election and inauguration, Román is now in Managua, and as Sacasa's personal secretary, has a unique opportunity to observe Sandino. Román is taken to the airport to meet Sandino's plane on February 2, 1933. This first experience with Sandino is quite impressive to young Román. Sandino's plane arrives, the area suddenly fills with all kinds of people, and "someone yelled 'Fellow Nicaraguans, here is Sandino and he brings you peace" (Román, 1979: 13).

The next morning after Sacasa and Sandino have signed the peace agreement, "the entire town of Managua was madly asking for Sandino" because they want to mount a demonstration for him. Sandino replied,

> Demonstrations are for political propaganda and for promising something to the people. I have nothing to promise them. I have worked and struggled for the people without telling them and without them looking at me. I don't like to call attention to myself. I am grateful in my soul to the people of Managua but now is not the time for that. Another day. (Román, 1979: 22)

[28] Indicating his international fame if not popularity, Sandino will tell the author Salvador Calderón Ramírez that he has received over 7,000 letters in the course of 6 years (Calderón, 1934: 75).

Sandino, Sacasa and their delegates, with Somoza also in attendance, then hold a type of press conference at the Presidential palace. The General demonstrates quite a sense of humor as he seems to poke fun at himself but is really taking a jab at US press coverage of him. Sandino, standing with Sacasa and in front of various North American journalists says to Sacasa, "Doctor, this short, stubby, muddy person is the same that was in the mountains fighting seven years, only now to become a soldier of peace... This is the terrible bandit Sandino" (Román, 1979: 22). Sacasa, moved and amused, embraces him and says "General Sandino, You are a bandit - sublime and glorious! You are the greatest hero of all the continent..." (Román, 1979: 22).

Sandino leaves the presidential palace, and thousands of people are at the airfield and have been waiting there since early morning. Román (1779: 23) writes,

> The tumult was incredible and before taking the airplane, hundreds of cameras flashed and everyone wanted to embrace Sandino and since the people were asking for a few words, he stopped on the ramp...while the multitude was listening reverently, his words resounded:
> 'Brother Nicaraguans...I have brought peace. From now on it depends only on you Nicaraguans to know how to maintain this independence that has cost us so much blood and sacrifice.'

Sandino then leaves for las Segovias as the crowd erupts in a storm of applause and 'Viva Sandino!'

Sandino sends for Román on February 23, the day after his army surrenders it weapons. "Lower your head," commands Sandino when Román enters. Román (1979: 29) then relates the following story:

> I lowered my head and he began to touch me on the skull...Finishing the exam he told me very seriously...,
>
> 'In you is incarnate the spirit of...one of the Seven Wise Men of Greece. When were you born?'

> ‘May 8, General.’
>
> ‘I on the 18th, we are the same planetary sign. The bull. And what year?’
>
> ‘In 1906.”’
>
> ‘Aha! Let me see...’ And he consulted a little book he was carrying. ‘Incredible!’ he said. ‘In the Chinese calendar..., we are also the same sign. The horse. I don’t know another person that has my same signs...Look Román, I have faith in you.’

Later in the interview, Sandino will speak of the Magnetic-Spiritual of the Universal Community, reincarnation, Rosicrucians, spiritism, yoga, theosophy and intuitive inspirations (Román: 1979). The General also mentions that, in spite of the danger to himself, he will not leave Nicaragua because he must pursue “a resolution that is rational and intuitively inspired by cosmic vibrations...It’s my destiny!” (Román, 1979).

Román spends twenty-seven days in Sandino’s camp and has numerous lengthy conversations with the General. The purpose of the book seems to be to allow Sandino to tell his own story with periodic comment from Román. Sandino tells much of his story in chronological order beginning with his childhood and youth, and much of that narrative is included in the first part of this chapter. Additionally, he relates the story of the dawning of his political awareness and stories of battles, also previously noted here.

One of the most interesting features of Román’s interview with the General is that Sandino spends much time talking about his officers and troops as well as about support from non-combatants. For example, Sandino describes each of his senior staff at some length. The apparent natural recall of detail that Sandino is able to relate is remarkable. He describes their skill and knowledge as soldiers and officers, their

commitment to their struggle and may even include personal facts like their birthplace, their families or comments about their physical appearance. Sandino gives special attention to those officers who are not Nicaraguan and says that Nicaragua owes them a special debt of gratitude (Román, 1979).

One of Sandino's most endearing qualities is that he seems to personally identify with followers as he expresses understanding of their lives and appreciation for their work. For example, he goes into great detail explaining the suffering that his soldiers experience. Insects, snakes, bad weather, disease, hunger and anxiety are all things that Sandino notes as difficulties that his soldiers endure. Of particular interest is the amount of time Sandino spends singling out the women in his army for praise. The General notes that women from all social classes supported the cause in a variety of ways including delivering mail, recruitment, nursing, and domestic work. The greatest appreciation for women is reserved for the work they did in espionage. Sandino (Román, 1979: 142) boasts:

> Women were in charge of the greater part of the secret service...Many of them were from the richest and oldest families and passed information through their servants. Many ambushes were due to the precise information provided by these women.

The methods they use include sewing messages into hatbands and carrying mail in their underwear. Such praise for women was rather rare in this period.

In talking about the advantage that the Marines might have had through their airplanes, Sandino implicitly links himself to an indigenous symbol of resistance to outsiders. He mentions that the Marines call Nicaragua a god damned country. He

insists that Román call his book "Damned Country!" Then Sandino (Román, 1979: 160) goes on to say:

> In truth poor Nicaragua has been a damned country. First, the Spanish gave it its name taking it from a cowardly chief...If it had not been for the traitorous help of Nicarao, Diriangén would have thrown them in the lake and finished with them. Nicaragua should have been called Diriangén or Diriamba.

He continues that recently Nicaragua has been a damned country for the North Americans.

Sandino's presentation of himself in Román's work is that he is humble, indigenous, a hard worker, a patriot, determined, spiritual, disciplined, proud of and connected to his troops, and grateful to his followers. In contrast, he even admits that his troops practice brutality but speaks of his confession of the brutality as a virtue as compared to the failure of the Yankees to admit that they practice it as well. Román is largely sympathetic to Sandino, offering some praise for the General, some neutral comment and some mild criticism. One particular sentence seems to summarize Román's view of Sandino. "Only one soldier of the revolution took the national flag and continued the war...against the United States intervention in Nicaragua. That soldier was General Augusto César Sandino," writes Román (1979: 7) at the beginning of his book.

On March 13, 1933 Sandino issues the "Manifesto to the People of the Earth and Especially to Nicaragua." The manifesto pledges Sandino's support to Dr. Sacasa's presidency while making a point of saying that he, Sandino, is politically independent. The document also criticizes the continuing influence of Wall Street bankers in Central America and calls for a Central American federal district. The federal district is to one

day be created from over 36,000 acres that the Sandinistas are converting into a farming cooperative at Wiwilí under Sandino's leadership.[29]

Sandino also makes it clear in this document that he does not necessarily perceive the struggle against Yankee imperialism to be over. He likens the problem to a casting net and says that, in order to untie one knot of the net, one must also untie others. Therefore, Latin Americans must continue to resist Yankee interference until the Yankees have ceased to interfere and respect Latin American sovereignty. In making these points, Sandino twice emphasizes his arguments with the Biblical phrase "He who has ears, let him hear. He who has eyes, let him see" (Sandino, 1990: 464).

Even though Sandino has pledged support to Sacasa, he is expressing his disenchantment with some of the government's activities. In a letter to Alemán Bolaños, Sandino complains that while Nicaraguans are pleased with the military withdrawal of the US, they fail to recognize that the political and economic intervention continues. Apparently, the Sacasa government was preparing to accept a multi-million dollar loan from US bankers. He contrasts these Nicaraguans with himself and his soldiers noting that they fought a seven year war without receiving compensation. Furthermore, he says, "...I was never a soldier, but merely a campesino fighting for the Autonomy of our people" (Sandino, 1988: 102).

General Sandino goes to Managua a second time in May to meet with Sacasa. A

[29] Notably, Sandino has never demonstrated an interest in agricultural policy or agrarian reform and is not now interested in it either as he does not demand or even suggest it for Nicaragua. Apparently, he sees no need for it since there "is a lot of land to distribute" without reform (de Belausguigoitia, 1985:182).

press release issued by Sandino says that the purpose of the trip is to respond to the hopes of many groups who wish to organize a new political party called the Autonomist Party. However, Sacasa delays the meeting, and Sandino suspects that it is because the president does not want a third party (Sandino, 1981b).

The Sandinista's tenuous relationship with the National Guard is souring through the rest of 1933. Sandino criticizes the Guard in several writings beginning in June. First, he writes that President Sacasa has a historic opportunity to constitutionally restore Nicaragua's political and economic independence. He then goes on to complain that some of his men have been murdered by the Guard since the EDSNN surrendered its arms. Several times, he calls the Guard unconstitutional and, therefore, irresponsible. The Guard operates outside the nation's laws and must immediately turn to support President Sacasa and the Constitution. If it does not, then he says that the president is obligated to arm the civilian population and disarm the Guard. Sandino sees this problem as urgent (Sandino, 1990). He then writes to Sacasa in August that his army has once again taken up arms upon hearing the news that government arsenals were burned. He suspects that Somoza is behind the sabotage. Therefore, he decides to go a third time to meet with Sacasa to discuss, among other things, the National Guard's treatment of Sandinistas, particularly "the unjust imprisonments that the Sandinistas are suffering in [the northern] departments" (Sandino, 1981b: 356). However, Sacasa also wants to speak with Sandino as the president worries about the Sandinistas rearming and even requesting more arms from the government. Somoza demands that the president totally disarm the Sandinistas (Macaulay, 1985).

At the close of 1933, Nicaragua has enjoyed almost a full year of relative peace. Sandino is describing himself as a peacemaker and lover of peace. He is still casting himself as one of the common people - a peasant, citizen, working class, humble, and not a politician. He repeatedly calls himself independent, a patriot, and disinterested in political or financial reward. He still has a historical destiny, a divine calling and is the redeemer of the Nicaraguan people. Now, he is predicting his own murder but not at the hands of Yankees. In his interview with Román (1979: 99), Sandino tells him:

> I will not leave here [Nicaragua]. I know that because of these ideas they will kill me. Not the Marines, but Nicaraguans. I know it but it doesn't matter because that is my destiny, the same that brought me here. At least I will leave a seed planted and some day it will bear fruit.

Similarly, Sandino predicts his death in conversations with Sofonías Salvatierra. On February 13 - days before his murder - Sandino tells Salvatierra that the National Guard has been surrounding his men for the last month at the Sandinista farming cooperative in Wiwilí. "General Somoza wants to destroy me," he says (Salvatierra, 1980: 234). These comments come after Salvatierra has suggested several times that Sandino leave the country for his own safety. Sandino refuses each time. President Sacasa believes that Sandino must stay to help consolidate the peace and then can leave in two or three years (Román, 1979).

"There Was a Hero"

Sandino arrives in Managua on February 16, 1934 to discuss disarmament and meets with Sacasa and Somoza at the presidential palace on February 18. In an interview on February 18, Sandino says that his men will not disarm until the Guard becomes an organization that is constitutional. In Salvatierra's (1934: 197) view, "the great obstacle

to disarmament and for pacification in general was some elements of the Guard..." Until the Guard is constitutional, Sandino's men will remain armed, acting as an emergency force under President Sacasa's orders. In a letter to Sacasa the next day (February 19), Sandino again terms the Guard unconstitutional and urges Sacasa to rectify the situation and to guarantee the safety of Sandino's men (Sandino, 1981b). Sacasa somewhat vaguely agrees to reform the Guard in the next six months and to protect the men who fought under Sandino's command, but he still wants to "collect all arms now outside the Government's control..." (Selser, 1981: 173).

The stream of letters, manifestos and interviews that has flowed for seven years from Sandino stops with his February 19 letter to Sacasa. On February 21, Sandino dines at the Presidential Palace with President Sacasa, National Guard chief Anastasio Somoza and several others, including two of Sandino's generals. General Sandino leaves the gathering at around ten o'clock that evening, and his car is stopped by Guardsmen while trying to exit the palace gate. Minister of Agriculture and Labor Salvatierra, Sandinista generals Umanzor and Estrada, and Sandino's father, don Gregorio are also in the car. The Sandinistas are ordered out of the car, and Salvatierra and don Gregorio Sandino are taken to jail. The Guardsmen drive Sandino and his generals to the airfield. Guardsmen open fire on them with machine guns. Upon hearing the shots that kill his son, Don Gregorio Sandino remarks to Salvatierra, "Now they are killing them; he who sets himself up as a redeemer, dies crucified" (Selser, 1981: 177). Meanwhile, other Guardsmen go to the home of Minister Salvatierra as Sandino's brother, Sócrates, and two of the General's aides were to be there. The Guardsmen kill Sócrates and two other

young occupants of the house.[30] Sandino's body and the bodies of Sócrates, General Umanzor, General Estrada and the two young victims are brought together. The bodies are stripped of valuables and then buried near Lake Managua (Salvatierra, 1934; Ibarra, 1973; Selser, 1981). The next day the National Guard moved on the Sandinista cooperative at Wiwilí and killed hundreds. Salvatierra takes refuge in the Presidential Palace and then leaves for Panama on March 11, 1934 and, ultimately, self exile in Spain.

Sofónias Salvatierra writes one of the more interesting accounts of Sandino's role in Nicaraguan history soon after leaving Nicaragua in 1934. Because he was something of a confidante to Sandino, but not quite a follower, and was in the car with Sandino on the evening of his murder, he brings an eyewitness account like no other. He tells the story of Sandino's entrance into the Liberal revolt in 1926, and Sandino's rejection of the Tipitapa agreement. The author implies that the Yankees are out to conquer and subjugate native peoples. Salvatierra expresses his admiration for Sandino in that it was an extraordinary feat that Sandino and his banner became recognized and saluted internationally. However, much of the book is devoted to the troubles of 1933 and 1934, which is after the peace agreement was signed. The Guard seems to continue to search for a way to sabotage the armistice. According to Salvatierra, the one who uses the word "peace" most in the peace talks is Sandino, and he is also the one who tried to erase political divisions saying he would even embrace Moncada out of patriotism. Nevertheless, Salvatierra (1934: 218) says, "It is the Guard that declared irreconcilable

[30] Neither of Sandino's two aides that were to be at Salvatierra's house were killed. Colonel Santos López escaped but was wounded and Colonel Ferreti had changed his plans and had not, in fact, been there (Macaulay, 1985).

war..."

Salvatierra was sympathetic but not a full-fledged follower of Sandino and was part of Sacasa's administration. Therefore, Salvatierra's account seems somewhat objective, but he still views Sandino as a charismatic person. For example, Salvatierra (1934) compares Sandino's struggle to those of Bolívar, Lincoln, and Joan of Arc. His point is that each encountered unwarranted hatred, sacrificed themselves for their countries and asked forgiveness for their opponents. Another attribution of exceptional or divine characteristics by Salvatierra claims that Sandino could understand as no one else could the problems of America. Salvatierra (1934: 192) writes, ". . . in the soul of the warrior of Las Segovias there was a clear vision of the central problem [foreign intervention] on our continent." He also places Sandino historically as a continuation of others who fought nobly for freedom in the Americas. Sandino is "...a mestizo...in whose hands it was foretold the accurate and flexible arrow of Diriangén,[31] or the George Washington's creative sword of the people..." would be placed (Salvatierra, 1934: 44).

Salvador Calderón Ramírez, a Nicaraguan journalist and educator, also wrote of Sandino just after his death in Últimos días de Sandino (Sandino's Last Days), published in 1934 in Mexico. Although Calderón was not a follower of Sandino, he admired the General and served as one of Sandino's representatives at the peace talks. He was not initially impressed with Sandino but gravitated to him because of his own intense dislike of the North Americans. At first, he thought of Sandino as a false liberator, "a conceited

[31] At the time of conquest, Diriangén was an indigenous chief in the area of the current Department of Carazo. He battled against the Spanish military leader Gil Gonzalez Dávila in 1522 while another chief, Nicarao, surrendered to the Spanish (Meyer, 1972: 142).

and sinister figure," whose purpose was to gain riches and power (Calderón, 1934: 10). He was also disgusted by the cruelty of some of Sandino's subordinates. The two did not meet one another until the peace talks began but began corresponding in late 1932.

Calderón begins to change his opinion as he realizes that many people have a favorable impression of the General. The author was living in El Salvador for most of the years of Sandino's war and heard news second hand from supporters and enemies of Sandino. One day, he asked a history class of thirty-four students to identify the most beloved warrior in America. Twenty-eight of the votes were cast for Sandino. Calderón (1934: 16) comes to conclude, "...Sandino beats in the heart of everyone." In addition, he says that "the belief became firmer and firmer in my brain that Nicaraguans should give glory, splendor and praise the devotion to the hero: his glory, there was no doubt, was the remission of our national faults, the shining purifier of our falls" (Calderón, 1934: 16). It seems that in those last days, Calderón was becoming somewhat frustrated with Sandino's performance in the disarmament talks (Macaulay, 1985). Calderón himself admits that, at times, he did not think very highly of Sandino's intellectual capabilities. Then came "the sinister night" when Sandino was murdered (Calderón, 1934: 156). When writing his book soon after that night, Calderón (1934: 67) can say, "...when our grandchildren ask...there was a hero - Sandino - who our countrymen called demented; in his divine madness stole the sacred fire from the stars of heaven, and...lit a torch and with its light destroyed the darkness..."

Sandino on Himself

According to Augusto César Sandino, he came to understand misery and oppression during his childhood. Therefore, he also understood what social justice must

be, and that understanding drove him to wage war on behalf of justice. As presented in Chapter Four, Sandino left a wealth of material that constitute a presentation of self. There is also a lot of material written by others that was either approved by Sandino or based on interviews with him. Additionally, the material addresses a history of Nicaragua presented that includes its relationship to the United States.

According to Sandino and those sympathetic to him, General Sandino was humble, working class, a peasant, and indigenous. He was also honest, hard-working, loyal, sincere, and confident. Sandino had a sharp wit. Selflessness and self-denial and a disinterest in personal gain characterized the General. He seeks only justice for Nicaragua.

A keen sense of right and wrong drew Sandino into the Constitutionalist War in 1926 and then kept him from laying down his arms with the traitor Moncada. He was not only principled but willing to stand alone against the Yankees and became more determined in spite of any setbacks. Sandino was unafraid; he was unimpressed and unintimidated by either Yankee military or economic power. Although unschooled, he was extremely intelligent and was a natural leader and a natural military strategist. As a leader, Sandino was very kind to his followers and very caring about them as individuals. Thus, he enjoyed their love, loyalty and personal devotion. Sandino was enormously popular with his own followers, other Latin Americans and ultimately, most Nicaraguans. On the other hand, he demanded a strict adherence to his behavioral codes and was quite intolerant of betrayal.

Sandino's image of North Americans is that the United States government operates from not simply self interest but at the behest of Wall Street bankers. The US

Marines, who have periodically invaded Nicaragua, are tools of Wall Street who use the pretext of protecting American lives in order to control Nicaragua on behalf of Yankee profits. Nicaraguan sellouts like Moncada were complicit in Yankee domination. Sandino could be cold regarding this enemy, admitting to some torture, mutilation and executions of Yankees by his troops but all due to the US leaving no alternatives to oppressed Nicaraguans. On the other hand, he could be quite considerate of a Yankee soldier's family.

Sandino was a spiritual man and was quite conscious that he was the tool of divine justice. He also understood that he was playing a historical role as Nicaragua's redeemer. Bolívar and Zeledón were his precursors, and it was his calling to carry on and finish their work. Sandino was not only a nationalist and anti-imperialist but an internationalist who had a pan-American vision. His role as visionary not only included the idea of a united Latin America, but a socially progressive national policy that recognized the rights of workers and women. He became a peacemaker because he was a man of his word. He made peace but expressed his disquiet about the developing role of the National Guard and his suspicions about Somoza. Sandino even assumed his own martyrdom at the hands of Nicaraguans. Most importantly, Sandino beat the military of the most powerful nation in the hemisphere and, perhaps, on earth. Upon his death, he became a hero forever.

Sandino's Construction of History and His Living Charisma

The presentation of Sandino, as provided by himself, places him firmly in the sweep of Nicaragua's history and defines charisma in the sociological sense. The study is concerned less with Sandino's reconstruction of history than that of the contemporary

Sandinistas. However, brief discussion is useful. For example, he and his followers refer to him as Simón Bolívar's equal as well as the continuation of Bolívar's Latin American legacy. Furthermore, Sandino is continuing the resistance of the ancient Nicaraguan warrior Diriangén, who stubbornly fought the invading conquistadors. He mentions numerous times that it is his historical destiny to rid his homeland of the newest invaders.

In addition, Sandino practices negation as he clearly identifies the enemy, the invaders, the blond beasts. He continually hammers the point about links between Nicaragua's desperate economic situation, the exploitation of it by Wall Street bankers, the role of the Marines as Wall Street's enforcers and then the replacement of the Marines by the National Guard. In doing so, he is reconstructing a past of, at least, several decades. Even when he does not mention the Yankees or National Guard by name, he is regularly calling himself and/or his struggle nationalist and anti-imperialist.

Sandino is a visionary who can clearly see the source of Nicaragua's distress as a historical problem. He can also envision the solution to it as he states a multitude of times that he is a nationalist and patriot who is willing to sacrifice himself to fulfill his destiny for the sake of his country. Furthermore, he can project a strong future for Nicaragua, without foreign interference, and a similar future for a Central American union. Yet, he is more than a great patriot and visionary. He is charismatic.

As a charismatic leader, Sandino appears in a time of distress in Nicaragua, has the answer to the distress, is not an elite, has exceptional or divine qualities and enjoys the obedience and extraordinary affection of his followers. The distress is US Marine occupation and political turmoil, and his answer is to expel the Marines. Sandino arises from outside the status quo of Nicaraguan political or military tradition. The General

admits to a lack of formal training for his task. In fact, he makes a point of often mentioning that he is one of the common people and the oppressed class, and that point of humility endears him to his civilian supporters as well as to his army. His followers are certain that he is exceptional and is, in fact, destined to lead them out of their desperation. Their willing devotion is also because of and rewarded by Sandino's uncanny ability to know them and treat each one as a special individual. A Honduran who joined Sandino's army writes to Froylán Turcios and captures the thoughts of many of Sandino's followers:

> ...God guides us illuminating us with the sublime patriotism of General Augusto César Sandino, invincible hero who marches from triumph to triumph...We are fighting at the side of the symbol of Liberty General Sandino, champion of the Race (Instituto de Estudio del Sandinismo, 1985a: 169).

Somoza García (1976: 549) even writes that Sandino is "considered an apostle" by his followers.

Sandino's followers also willingly submit, themselves to his authority, though not blindly. For example, Colonel Santos López reports that women fought with their husbands and had their babies on the battlefields, "following Sandino in his call to the struggle" (López, nd: 21). In another instance, Sandino ordered all the peasants of a town to leave and build elsewhere. They complied. In addition, the rural population defied the National Guard and surreptitiously provided food, clothing, and shelter to Sandino's guerrillas (Sandino, 1981b).

Again, Sandino's enemies also recognized the authority he had over his followers. A National Guard lieutenant who helped bury Sandino remarked on the obedience of the peasants to Sandino's orders: "It would be difficult for a leader to

repeat the feat of having the opportune and valiant cooperation of the peasants of Segovias, which they gave to General Sandino" (Ibarra, 1973: 20).

The emotional commitment of Sandino's followers toward him again demonstrates his charisma. In reading the accounts written by and about Sandino and his followers, the depth of the followers' love and personal loyalty is quite impressive. It is perhaps this feature of his leadership that provides the clearest evidence of his charisma, living and posthumous. They do not speak of him in a simply respectful fashion as North Americans might speak of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson or even more recent men recognized as great leaders such as Franklin D. Roosevelt. As stated previously, his followers believed that he was extremely kind, cared for each one of them and that he was like a father. He was exciting, smart and interesting and they relished being a part of his mission. One of his soldiers remembers:

> Speaking of General Sandino is for me an exciting memory of a stage in my life; a stage in my youth, the most glorious and at the same time happy and satisfactory that I have had...he was a genius...Sandino, now, is listening to me in immortality: for me he is a semi-god (IES, 1986: 286).

The North Americans did not find Sandino to be particularly kind or fatherly. Some US observers did recognize his charismatic qualities, but the State Department and the Marines appeared uninterested in this feature of his leadership. Instead, they too quickly dismissed Sandino and his crazy little army.

CHAPTER V

SANDINO'S EMERGENCE: THE NORTH AMERICAN VIEW

Philander Chase Knox, Secretary of State appointed by President William Howard Taft, toured the countries of the Caribbean in 1912 and made a stop in Nicaragua. There he delivered a speech lauding the creation and purpose of the Central American Court of Justice, which is to adjudicate disputes between the five Central American republics, to reform constitutions, to refrain from intervention in any country in case of civil war, and to refuse to recognize revolutionary governments until constitutionally recognized in the country where the revolution is occurring. Knox implies that the United States will support the Court's work and then attempts to soothe Central American fears about the "the true motives and purposes of the United States toward [the republics of Latin America] under the Monroe Doctrine. I beg to assure you...that my Government does not covet an inch of territory south of the Rio Grande," Knox assures the President of the Nicaraguan National Assembly (Knox, 1913: 57). The Secretary then makes a rather emphatic statement that seems full of irony just a few years later as the Liberal rebellion begins and as Sandino emerges. "...I do wish to avail myself of the opportunity," states Knox, "to repeat that the Government of the United States does not propose in any way to interfere in the internal affairs of this country" (Knox, 1913: 67).

A few years later, author Mary Williams (1916: 315) in her analysis of US policy toward Central America notes:

> The large investment of American capital in Central America and the proximity of the region to the Panama Canal Zone was bound greatly to increase American interest in the Central American states...In consequence, a system of interference in Central American matters, resembling tutelage, developed. Nicaragua, because of her disorganized condition, has received the largest share of attention."

She cites Knox's visit as his attempt "to explain that the United States wished merely to establish such condition of peace and security as would remove all necessity for direct intervention" (Williams, 1916: 317). However, by that time, Williams notes that there was a growing controversy in the US regarding the implementation of the Monroe Doctrine as many believed that its use was no longer helpful to the US and inspired resentment toward the United States in Latin America.

Contributing to the controversy, authors Nearing and Freeman publish in 1925 a stinging critique of "American imperialism" in their book Dollar Diplomacy. They select several case studies to demonstrate that US economic penetration of countries such as China, Mexico, Haiti, the Philippines, and Nicaragua is the "opening wedge of imperialism" (1925: 19). In the case of Nicaragua, they argue that "the strategic interests of American diplomats and the financial interests of American bankers combined to produce first diplomatic and later military intervention" (1925: 151). Specifically, these interests are the canal route and the control exercised over the Nicaraguan economy by Brown Brothers and J & W Seligman.

While there was an argument in the United States about the propriety of US intervention and economic penetration in other countries, the pro-intervention and pro-penetration side of the argument reigned. Government officials espoused these policies as either necessary to protect US lives and property or to stabilize an uncertain situation

in order to protect US interests. The way in which these policies and situation were reported in periodicals, such as the New York Times, usually cast administration and business policy in a positive light and other views as disruptive, illegitimate or, at least, odd.

Civil War: Nicaragua's "National Sport"

By the summer of 1925, the US Marine occupation force disembarked from Nicaragua leaving behind a new national constabulary to replace themselves and headed by a retired United States army major, Calvin B. Carter. His job was to direct the training school for this national police force in addition to managing the force itself. Before Carter could build what would become the National Guard into an organization of strength, volatile Nicaraguan politics once again erupted, and there was a Liberal uprising in late 1926 that includes Juan Batista Sacasa declaring himself President *in abstentia*. The Guard grew in strength with heavy support from the US State Department, and the uprising was temporarily quelled. However, with Mexican financial support and Mexican arms, Liberals again revolted. On January 4, 1927 the US Marines returned to Nicaragua, at President Diaz' request, to repel the Liberal threat to the government (Booth, 1985).

Published in July 1927, an analysis of the generation-long strife between Nicaraguan Liberals and Conservatives is written by Major Carter (1927) and entitled "The Kentucky Feud in Nicaragua: Why Civil War Has Become Her National Sport." In spite of its somewhat patronizing title, Carter has some interesting insights regarding the extreme economic stratification in Nicaragua and the lack of popular participation in political life. Just as interesting is the fact that he does not include US involvement in

Nicaragua's economy or government as anything but the occasional reaction to Nicaraguan requests. Neither does he make any mention of Sandino.

Soon after this latest landing of United States Marines in the country of Nicaragua, heated debate on the topic begins in the US Senate. On January 26, 1927 an exchange takes place between Senators Edge of New Jersey and Wheeler of Montana regarding the propriety of the marines once again occupying Nicaragua. Senator Edge argues that "the Government of the United States should...move to protect the rights and property of American citizens" in Nicaragua and not wait until lives or property have been lost (Congressional Record, 1927: 2292). He also argues that the Senate should support the actions of the government rather than criticize, "unjustifiably harass and embarrass it" (Congressional Record, 1927: 2293).

Senator Burton Wheeler of Montana, harsh critic of this administration policy, first expresses his frustration regarding reasons given by administration officials for the latest intervention. He also suggests that the administration's motive had, perhaps, more to do with its Mexican policy than with Nicaragua itself (Congressional Record, 1927: 2284):

> First we learned that the marines were sent to the little Republic to protect American lives and property; then they were sent there to protect the paper canal which we wrung from the people of Nicaragua by questionable means: at the end of the week we were there to protect the Americas from Bolshevism...They knew that this cry of Bolshevism and the protection of lives and property in Nicaragua is but an effort of this administration to justify war with Mexico.

In addition, Wheeler notes that Nicaragua's President Díaz previously worked for La Luz & Los Angeles Mining Company, an American company represented by its attorney and former Secretary of State Philander Knox. He scolds US mining and railroad interests

operating in Nicaragua but reserves the most severe criticism for American bankers. "But the State Department policy is built around the exploitation of Nicaragua by Brown Bros. and J. & W. Seligman" and that active intervention in Nicaragua is "in the interest of profitable investments for [these] bankers," argues Wheeler from the Senate floor (Congressional Record, 1927: 2290).

By the spring of 1927 the New York Times was informing the American public of a peace agreement between President Adolfo Díaz' Conservative government of Nicaragua and the Liberal revolutionaries there. The agreement was mediated by Henry L. Stimson, "President Coolidge's special emissary" ("Truce...," 1927: 1) with support from Senator Borah, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations ("Threat Confirmed...", 1927). While both Conservative Nicaraguan President Díaz and Liberal revolutionary General José María Moncada were willing to talk to Stimson, the Times reports on May 5, 1927 that Stimson's conference with Moncada at Tipitapa "ended today in deadlock" and that "nearly 100 marines were on guard" around Moncada and Stimson as they talked ("Moncada Rejects..." 1927: 16). Also in attendance at that meeting are other Liberal party representatives, as well as Charles Eberhardt (US Minister to Nicaragua), and Rear Admiral Julian Latimer (commander of US naval forces in Nicaragua). The stalemate resulted from Moncada's unwillingness to sign any peace agreement that included the continuation of Adolfo Díaz as President of Nicaragua. After warring against Díaz and the Conservatives for so long, the Liberals could not abide another minute of the Díaz presidency. Nevertheless, the Times reports the next day that, due to Stimson's efforts, General Moncada and the Liberals have reluctantly agreed to lay

down their arms in spite of their continued objection to Díaz. In fact, the page one headline declares that the "Truce in Nicaragua is Won by Stimson" ("Truce..." 1927).

Henry L. Stimson is one of the primary figures responsible for constructing the reality of the Nicaragua of the 1920s and the story of Augusto César Sandino for the North American public. Stimson is primarily known as Secretary of War under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman during World War II. However, his career of governmental service began long before. After graduating from Harvard Law School in 1890, Stimson went to work for the New York law firm of Root and Clarke. Senior partner Elihu Root had been Secretary of War in McKinley's administration and Secretary of State under Theodore Roosevelt. Root and Stimson became close friends, and Root advised Stimson for over fifty years. During the Roosevelt years, Stimson was appointed New York district attorney at Root's suggestion. While in office, Stimson successfully prosecuted several large corporations for violation of anti-trust laws and for corporate fraud. After waging an unsuccessful campaign for governor of New York in 1910, Stimson accepted President Taft's appointment of him as Secretary of War until 1913. He briefly served in the military during World War I and returned to the US to help defeat US membership in the League of Nations. He returned to private law practice during the Harding administration. Henry L. Stimson's mission to seek a solution to Nicaragua's civil war marked his return to public service in 1927 (Stimson & Bundy, 1947; Ferrell, 1963; Hodgson, 1990).

Stimson leaves a remarkable record of his perspective regarding Nicaragua and US policy. His book, American Policy in Nicaragua, as well as his quotes in the New York Times, provide much of the official US construction of Nicaragua and Sandino as

presented to the American public. Before Stimson explains his own presence in Nicaragua, he begins with a discussion of the "geographical, racial and historical conditions" of Nicaragua (Stimson, 1927: 2). Stimson sees the country as politically and economically unstable and in need of US guidance in order to resolve these problems. He argues that the country has no true democracy since the President of Nicaragua appoints the governors of the departments (analogous to states) from within his own party. Therefore, the system promotes revolts because revolution is the only way for the dispossessed party to assume power. Stimson (1927: 10) notes that "the United States...has in many ways endeavored to lend its assistance to the five Central American countries in their progress along the difficult road to orderly self-government." In discussing US recognition of Adolfo Díaz as Nicaraguan president, he explains US policy regarding granting recognition to another nation's government and instructs the reader that "the American officer who is vested by our American Constitution with the duty of determining which claimant in a foreign government is legitimate is the President of the United States and no other" (Stimson, 1927: 28).

In spite of Stimson's apparent success in Nicaragua, the New York Times reports a rather serious charge lodged by Moncada against Stimson. Moncada explains to the press, "'Mr. Stimson told me that the United States Government intends to restore peace in Nicaragua immediately and use force if necessary to do so...We are forced by a greater power to cease our fight...'" ("Nicaragua Rebels Give Up..." 1927: 1). In the face of Moncada's charge of a threat of war by Stimson if the General did not agree to the terms of peace, the paper also reports that there is no evidence that Stimson was empowered to make such a threat on behalf of the United States. According to the Times, Stimson was

only to investigate the situation and encourage peace. Stimson's understanding of his mission varies from that of the New York Times in that he says he "was expressly given the utmost latitude with reference to observations on the policy theretofore adopted" and that he was to "investigate and report" as well as "if I should find a chance to straighten the matter out he [President Coolidge] wished I would try to do so" (Stimson, 1927: 43). On May 8, the Times confirms that "a threat of force was used in order to accomplish the purpose of [the United States] Government" but quickly says that the threat "should not be taken too literally" (Oulahan, 1927: 1). A Times editorial printed the next day states that the armistice was fair and that the Coolidge administration and Stimson acted properly under the circumstances but also admits that those difficult circumstances were, in part, created by the US. The editorial notes that "Uncle Sam does not think of himself as an overbearing Imperialist, but too many South Americans do" and that his "blundering method" is partly to blame for the imperialistic image ("The Nicaragua Settlement," 1927: 20).

Sandino: The "Disturbing Element"

On May 12 Henry Stimson sends a message to the State Department heralding the surrender of the Nicaraguan Liberal generals and the end of the insurrection. That message and the one following from Admiral Latimer are generally upbeat and business-like. However, Stimson's note contains one interesting sentence. "[The agreement] was signed by Moncada and eleven Generals, including all his prominent chiefs except Sandino" writes Stimson in his first public acknowledgment of Sandino and the Times' first mention of Sandino ("Nicaragua Revolt...," 1927: 4). The Times article about Stimson's report seems to characterize Sandino as a local problem that "will occupy the

attention of the native constabulary...and the American marines, who are to stamp out by force, if necessary, banditry in the country" ("Nicaragua Revolt...," 1927: 4). From the initial US official recognition of Sandino, he is not labeled as a revolutionary but as a criminal - "bandit" - though a criminal of no great significance.

Through May, Stimson spends much time explaining to President Coolidge and the press how horrific the Nicaraguan revolution had been. He describes the large death toll, the failure on both sides of the conflict to take prisoners, killing them instead, and a condition of anarchy in the country. The New York Times reports Stimson's descriptions as well as Stimson's contention that the current peace in Nicaragua was due to Nicaraguan faith in the ability of the United States to supervise and produce a fair election in 1928. Further, Stimson states that "this situation is now practically entirely ended" and that "each of the bands of semi-independent rebel chiefs who were engaging in guerrilla warfare on their own account has also delivered up its arms" ("War was Barbaric...," 1927: 9). There is no mention of Sandino in the statement presented in the Times. The article does mention that Stimson has a very high opinion of General Moncada and has little respect for Dr. Juan Sacasa, the political head of the revolutionaries. The newspaper also notes Stimson's opinion that American forces will soon be leaving Nicaragua.

Until July 1927, the New York Times coverage of the Nicaraguan situation has involved articles of about twelve or more column inches, each placed rather prominently. On July 2 a two-inch column appeared at the bottom of page ten and carried the headline "American Mine Seized by Nicaraguan Liberals." This obscure article reports Sandino's

initial act of seizing the gold mine of Charles Butters[32] and Butters' request for immediate protection from the US government of his $700,000 investment. "General Sandino's avowed purpose in seizing the property is said to be to destroy American influence," states the Times ("American Mine...," 1927: 10).

By mid-July the New York Times is printing characterizations of Sandino that call him "the only disturbing element in Nicaragua at the present time..." ("Ultimatum..." 1927: 10). The paper reports that Major G.D. Hatfield of the US marines is demanding the surrender of Sandino and promising a joint attack on Sandino's forces by US and Nicaraguan soldiers if Sandino does not comply. Furthermore, Brigadier General Feland sends a detachment of marines to recapture the Butters mine. As Sandino rejects Hatfield's ultimatum, he is characterized as defiant and as a "usurp[er]" of governmental authority. On the other hand, General Feland also says that Sandino is of no particular concern and that "the situation...will soon be adjusted" ("Nicaraguan Rebel..." 1927: 28).

While reporting the perspectives of US State Department and military officials, the New York Times also publishes a feature article analyzing the relationship of the United States to Nicaragua. The article is written by Whiting Williams, a sociologist who pioneered the study of working class people in different industries in the 1920s by using the participant-observation method. He also worked as a consultant to leading industrial corporations advising them how to improve labor-management relations. More specifically, Williams worked for some of the largest US corporations with operations in Nicaragua and Latin America. Guaranty Trust, United Fruit and Standard Oil are

[32] Butters' mine is often called "the San Albino mine."

examples. He advised Standard Oil and Shell Oil that the companies were contributing to social unrest in Cuba by paying and treating workers poorly. Williams told United Fruit that "the company needed to provide more worker recognition and security, better housing and medical care, more rewards for effort, and promotions of qualified local workers to supervisory positions..." (Wren, 1987: 76).

In his professional activities, Williams generally points toward the corporations' poor treatment of workers as a cause or contributor to social unrest. He continues the theme in the Times feature "Our Ways and Wares in Nicaragua" (Williams, 1927a). Williams blames US "commercial and cultural penetration into Central America" for much of the Nicaraguan resentment of the US and for Nicaraguan unrest. He notes the Nicaraguan dilemma of needing outside capital but insists that it is the same importation of capital that has been the target of Nicaraguan anger. The issue of US bankers collecting import and export duties in Nicaraguan customs houses has been particularly contentious.

On July 12, just more than a week after Williams' article explaining the local effects of US penetration into Nicaragua, Sandino rejects a demand for surrender from US marine captain GD Hatfield. The Times calls Sandino's answer to Hatfield "defiant" ("Nicaraguan Rebel Defiant," 1927: II.1). Hatfield immediately casts Sandino as "an individual outside the law, in rebellion against the government of Nicaragua...." and that the governments of Nicaragua and the United States cannot be held liable for any death or physical injuries resulting from the efforts of Nicaraguan and US military actions used to stop Sandino (Sandino, 1990: 78).

Casting Sandino as a rebel and criminal worthy of being the target of military action provides a logical prelude to the Times' extensive report the next day of the bloody defeat of Sandino's forces at Ocotal on July 17. The front-page story reports on July 18 that "United States marines and Nicaraguan constabulary severely repulsed General Sandino, recalcitrant Liberal, who attacked Ocotal yesterday afternoon and again today" and that the marines killed fifty Sandinistas and used planes to bomb Sandino's army ("Marines Repulse Nicaragua Rebels..." 1927). In the same issue of the New York Times, there is a two-column inch report on page nineteen that Admiral Latimer returns to the United States from Nicaragua aboard a United Fruit ship. Latimer's opinion is that there are only a very few persons in Nicaragua who want the US to remove its military from Nicaraguan soil ("Admiral Latimer Back," 1927).

When the New York Times reports the details of the battle at Ocotal, it casts the outnumbered US marines as immensely successful in defeating Sandino and portrays Sandino as isolated, an outlaw, braggart, and bloodthirsty coward. The adjective for Sandino is "recalcitrant" while Hatfield is called "heroic." The article reports that forty marines supported by forty-plus of the Nicaraguan constabulary defeated 500 Sandinistas with only one marine death compared to 300 Sandinista deaths. During the seventeen hour battle, the paper reports that Sandino was heard to tell his men that they could loot at will and drink Yankee blood if they were victorious. It also notes that Sandino was not involved in the fighting but "directed his forces from a distance" ("Nicaraguan Battle Raged..." 1927: 1).

Another story on page ten of the same issue outlines the response of US Secretary of State Frank B. Kellogg to Sandino and the battle of Ocotal. The Secretary

attempts to further solidify the image of Sandino as an outlaw isolated among his own people. Kellogg's perspective is that Sandino was the lone revolutionary commander who refused to cooperate with the peace treaty at Tipitapa and that he "resorted to banditry, preying on the country and terrorizing the inhabitants, and that his activities have no political significance" ("Kellogg Justifies Defense," 1927: 10). The article continues that Sandino's cause is simply a matter of "private vengeance" aimed at punishing his former employer, the San Albino Gold Mining Company ("Kellogg Justifies Defense," 1927).

It is interesting to note that Secretary Kellogg first drew national attention in the United States when President Theodore Roosevelt appointed Kellogg to head the legal team devoted to trust-busting. Kellogg won cases against General Paper Company, Union Pacific Railroad and then Standard Oil in the most famous Sherman Anti-trust case. Additionally, Kellogg reportedly had a distaste for the habit of US interventionism in Latin America. Appointed in 1925 as Coolidge's Secretary of State, he oversaw the end of direct US intervention in Mexico and the removal of US marines from Nicaragua in 1925 (Ferrell, 1963). However, in the eyes of Latin Americans like Sandino, Kellogg's idea of retreating from an imperialist foreign policy still involved implicit and explicit efforts to bend Latin American countries' policies to North American will. After all, it was Coolidge and Kellogg who sent Henry Stimson to negotiate the Tipitapa treaty.

The next day, the Times paints an even less flattering picture of Sandino in defeat. The front page declares that he is a "hero to [a] horde of malcontents" who are deserting him after the defeat at Ocotal and is left with a "small group" of "bandits and assassins" to continue wreaking havoc in the Nicaraguan countryside ("Sandino in

Hiding..." 1927: 1). In spite of the reports of Sandino's sound defeat at Ocotal, the paper reports that Sandino is calling himself "the Wild Beast of the Mountains." Accompanying the previous article is one that lauds the performance of the US marines in the battle. Rear Admiral David Foote Sellers is quoted as saying that "Marines and Guardia...conducted themselves with distinguished gallantry, magnificently supported by our planes..." ("Chief Praises Marines," 1927: 2). The tone of the article changes dramatically as it quotes Sandino supporter Salomon de la Selva's comments critical of US policy in Nicaragua and saying that "the marines would 'have to destroy the entire population' if they did not leave Nicaragua" ("Chief Praises Marines," 1927: 2). Meanwhile, on the floor of the US Senate, Senator Walter F. George of Georgia is reportedly denouncing the marine action at Ocotal as the "shooting down of several hundred natives." In this three-column-inch article buried in the middle of page two, he also warns that South Americans will view US activity in Nicaragua as the US taking sides in internal politics and that "it is hazardous in another way because the minority of today may become the majority of tomorrow" ("Senator Scores Warfare," 1927: 2).

One month after US military officials laud their victory at Ocotal, sociologist Whiting Williams writes again of Nicaragua. While his previous article criticizes US business and government for their activities in Nicaragua, he delves further into local causes and contributors to Nicaraguan unrest. Williams lays most of the country's troubles at the door of the old feud between the Liberals and Conservatives. He tells of the forced recruiting by both factions of soldiers who do not understand the cause for which they are forced to fight. According to Williams, the perennial revolution interrupts the nation's productivity as the revolutionaries forcibly draft able-bodied laborers and

loot a business' tools, equipment, supplies, fields and livestock. Obviously, potential investors shy from this uncertainty. The upper class find instead that there is money to be made in politics and turn away from business. The undereducated masses are then uncertain of work and impoverished. Williams also cites the lack of taxation and roads as significant problems. Without taxation "every town and city must depend for its expenditures on the good will of the Central Government..." fueling the financial and sectional concerns of both parties (Williams, 1927a: 5.2). Williams argument then turns to the lack of roads and railroads. He highlights the isolation of communities and regions pointing out that increased contact among Nicaraguans would bring increased understanding. Interestingly, Williams never mentions Sandino's efforts.

Meanwhile, news coverage for the rest of 1927 about Nicaragua and Sandino focuses on three topics: the defeat and relative unimportance of Sandino's resistance, US support of General Moncada as the next president of Nicaragua, and increased ties between Nicaragua's finances and US supervision of them. Through September 1927, New York Times stories concentrate on General Feland's opinions that Sandino is hiding with only a handful of men or has perhaps left the country in fear. Feland's depiction of Sandino as weak and isolated is coupled with the image of him as "cold-blooded," "cruel," and a predator, as he is described by Charles Butters, owner of the San Albino Mine destroyed by Sandino's forces ("Sandino, Rebel..." 1927: 25.7).

After the marine victory at Ocotal, the Times publishes an article relating Admiral Latimer's view of the Nicaraguan situation. He repeats the routine claims of military superiority over Sandino's forces and again applies the negative labels to Sandino and his cause. Most interesting here is that Latimer provides a very brief

biography of Sandino that includes misinformation. For example, he says Sandino is between forty and fifty years old although Sandino is in his mid-thirties. However, Latimer's most compelling claim and egregious error of fact is his description of Sandino's experience in Mexico. The story was apparently originally told by Moncada, and it is unclear whether he was lying or grossly mistaken (Hodges, 1986). As related in a previous chapter, Sandino worked in Mexico from 1923 to 1926, arriving some years after the end of Zapata's and Villa's revolts. Nevertheless, Latimer ("Defeated Sandino..." 1927: 5) tells the Times:

> Previously, according to his own words, the Admiral continued, Sandino had been in Mexico for twenty-two years and boasted that at one time he was a Lieutenant of Villa and that, in the event of American 'intervention' in Nicaragua, he would become a second 'Pancho' there.

This quote from Latimer is very important because it represents a first effort by US government officials to publicly tie Sandino to unrest in Mexico. North American business was desperately concerned about Mexican moves to nationalize oil in that country, and the US government worried about the possibility of Bolshevism overtaking Mexico's political system. In 1926 and 1927 when Latimer creates the above story about Sandino, US tension with Mexico is at a crisis level, and there are suggestions of war between the two countries. The US ambassador to Mexico was telling the State Department that there was evidence that Mexico was doing Moscow's bidding and that the Liberal revolt in Nicaragua was caused and encouraged by the Mexican government (Smith, 1972).

Sandino and his cause are more directly tied to the Bolsheviks in this same article. The mining engineers report that "people ...who formerly were friendly to

Americans and worked contentedly in the mines are now anti-American and have been converted to 'radicalism and Bolshevism' by General Sandino" ("Rebellion Spreads..." 1927: 3). Such statements do not simply cast a negative light on Sandino and his struggle nor do they only accuse Sandino of being a threat to American business in Nicaragua. Instead, here he becomes an ideological threat to the United States marking a very interesting contradiction as others, such as Admiral Latimer, dismiss him.

Sandino's importance increases in the fall of 1927 as the New York Times reports that "government sources" and "American mining engineers" state that Sandino's efforts have passed from "banditry into a state of insurrection" ("Rebellion Spreads..." 1927: 3). The term "insurrection" brings new status to Sandino's fight and to the marine occupation. The new term comes as Sandino is reported to control most of three northern departments and to be gaining support among Nicaraguans in the north.

While the New York Times is running articles tying Sandino to Mexican revolutionaries, radicalism and Bolshevism, it is also printing stories telling of the troubles of US oil companies in Mexico. Pantepec Oil Company, the president of which is William F. Buckley, is embroiled in a $28,000,000 lawsuit against Transcontinental Oil, a subsidiary of Standard Oil ("Receiver Restored..." 1927). Standard Oil of New York then announces it is leaving Tampico ("To Remove Tampico..." 1927). All the while, Mexican president Calles is encouraging Mexican nationalism and instituting national control over resources through legislation such as the Petroleum Law and the

Alien Land Law.[33] Believing and making Sandino a part of Mexico's "Bolshevik" tendencies made US intervention in Nicaragua legitimate in the eyes of US government officials and, hopefully, in the eyes of the American public.

Next, the Times reports that the US is supporting Moncada's election as president of Nicaragua while giving several column inches to Moncada's criticisms of Sandino. The paper reports that the State Department "would be satisfied to see [General Moncada] elected [as Nicaraguan president] ("Moncada Approved..." 1927: 8). The article goes on, in some detail, to explain the legal legitimacy of his candidacy and to discuss Moncada's request that the US government "organize a constabulary under American officers in all parts of Nicaragua" ("Moncada Approved..." 1927: 8). It will become more important later that the creation and development of the constabulary be presented as a request from Nicaraguans. Moncada then proceeds to call Sandino a "bandit," a "fanatic," "not regular Army," a "thief," a "smuggler," and a "courageous outlaw" ("Moncada Approved..." 1927: 8). This name-calling seems intended to distance Moncada from Sandino and is further reinforced by Moncada's statements that he never commissioned Sandino during the Liberal rebellion, that he told Stimson at Tipitapa that he could not control Sandino and that Sandino has no current support from any political group ("Moncada Approved..." 1927: 8).

The New York Times ends 1927's reporting on Nicaragua with brief stories outlining Nicaragua's request for a two million dollar loan from Bankers Trust and J & W

[33] These laws restricted foreigners from owning certain types of land and stated that foreigners could not own controlling interest in land development companies. Of course, US mining and petroleum companies, in particular, were extremely threatened, and the US government was under extreme pressure by the companies to reverse Mexico's nationalist direction (Smith, 1972).

Seligman (“Nicaragua Requests..." 1927: 14). The United States State Department will appoint an American financial adviser to supervise the Nicaraguan government in connection with the loan, and proceeds from the loan will pay claims on damages resulting from recent unrest in the country ("Nicaraguan Loan..." 1927: 35; "Nicaragua Discusses Loan," 1927: 35).

A “Bamboo War”

Sandino's importance again increases in the presentation of him to the American public. At the beginning of 1928, the US sends 1,000 additional marines to Nicaragua as Admiral Sellars explains that Sandino's forces have offered stiffer resistance than expected. He also explains that this increase in marine strength in Nicaragua will put a strain on the corps as there are also thousands of marines occupying China and Haiti and on board warships around the globe ("1000 Additional Marines..." 1928).

Meanwhile, US Senators again debate, as they did the year before, whether Coolidge's policy on Nicaragua is correct. Again Republicans support the President, and Democrats, led by Senator Wheeler, call the policy immoral and unconstitutional ("Nicaragua Fighting Rouses..." 1928: 1). Reports of these debates and a handful of other articles or quotes in the Times let the US public know that, in spite of the official anti-Sandino history being constructed in the US, there are some North Americans who do not accept the official view.

On the same day that one of these stories of Congressional debate appears, another story relates an interview with Nicaraguan intellectual and Sandino supporter, Dr. Pedro Zepeda, who says that Sandino has been unjustly labeled a bandit and "has done nothing more than interpret national Nicaraguan sentiment" ("Sandino Exalted..." 1928:

2). Later, Senator Nye (R-North Dakota) heavily criticizes the presence of marines in Nicaragua arguing that money spent on the occupation forces would be better spent on farm relief in the US. He also argues that the war in Nicaragua is meant to support US corporate interests at the expense of failing to meet people's needs in the US ("Nye, Here, Assails Force..." 1928).

Various stories appear in the issue dated 6 January 1928 and include several stories about marine activities in Nicaragua and analysis of Sandino's motives. There is also a story quoting General Lejeune, Commandant of the marines, as repeating Admiral Latimer's report that Sandino served with Pancho Villa. This time the story includes a claim that Sandino was part of a Mexican raiding party that attacked a town in New Mexico ("Says Sandino with Villa..." 1928: 3). John Carter (1928: 178) identifies Sandino as “one of Villa’s anti-American lieutenants” as he bristles against “the charge of imperialism now brought against our Latin American policy” by critics. With these stories, Sandino is not only a threat to American interests on Nicaraguan soil but now seems more of a direct threat to US territory.

Another article continues the creation of a violent, revolutionary image of Sandino but also attributes his violence to a petty, self-centered streak in him as well as an uncontrollable temper. The article again places Sandino in Villa's army also analyzing his motives for revolt in Nicaragua. This time, the story says that Sandino was taken by his parents to Mexico as a boy and later served under Villa and, this time, the story casts doubt on the likelihood of a relationship with Villa. More importantly, the article relates a version of the story of how Sandino came to be involved in the Liberal rebellion and then to continue in spite of Moncada's peace treaty. It says that persons who know Sandino

state that he was ready to lay down his arms but became furious and changed his mind when General Moncada neglected to introduce Sandino to Henry Stimson. The story continues that his pride was so wounded that he decided to exact revenge in the form of armed rebellion and now American as well as Nicaraguan lives are being lost due to Sandino's reaction to Moncada's slight ("Slight to Sandino..." 1928).

Harold Norman Denny begins to report from Nicaragua for the New York Times in early 1928 and, specifically, covers the war, Sandino and the marines. Denny began working for the Times in 1922 and by 1926 was war correspondent for the paper. His assignment in 1928 to cover the war in Nicaragua was his third as war correspondent, and he spent it following the marines all over the Nicaraguan countryside by all modes of transportation including muleback and canoe ("Harold Denny, 56, Journalist, Dead," 1945). Denny's impression of the Nicaraguan situation was so profound that, in 1929, he published a book entitled Dollars for Bullets that told the history of US intervention in Latin America and defended that history ("Harold Denny..." 1945; "Denny, Harold Norman," 1948). Another American journalist, Carleton Beals, called Denny "an unusually brilliant reporter...who confided...that he had dared not send out a single word which was not 'official'" (Beals, 1932: 305). Denny, however, never interviewed Sandino.

The contradictions regarding the importance of Sandino continue in Denny's work. Articles referring to Sandino throughout the rest of 1928 include reports of Sandino's death and then the announcement that he is, in fact, alive (Denny, 1928a; 1928b). Then reports are that Sandino's army has been crushed and is of no serious consequence anymore in spite of the fact that the marines are sending reinforcements to

the front (Denny, 1928c). Reports are that Nicaraguans fear Sandino, thereby making him seem isolated among his own people and his struggle less valid. For example, Denny reports that well over 2,000 refugees have left their homes in Jinotega and Matagalpa for fear of an attack by General Sandino's troops (Denny, 1928d). The article also contains mention of the threat to coffee haciendas and coffee production by Sandino's activities.

By February 1928 a most common term used for Sandino is "elusive" or sometimes, "wily" (Denny, 1928e: 2; 1928f: 2; 1928g: 9). Use of these terms illustrate the frustration of marines and their commanders caused by their inability to locate and destroy Sandino's mountain hideout, El Chipote. The frustration finally decreased when the marines discovered El Chipote and captured it although Sandino's army already had abandoned it (Denny, 1928h: 24). It is also in February when Denny writes a feature story in which marines "make light" of the their difficulties in Nicaragua. '"This is only a bamboo war,"' Denny quotes a marine captain yet also says that the marines understand that killing is serious business (Denny, 1928i: V.4). Nevertheless, there is a constant suggestion throughout the article that the war in Nicaragua is not a "real" war as was World War I.

In stark contrast to Denny as a reporter and to Denny's work, journalist Carleton Beals writes a series of articles relating his interview with Sandino. Beals' articles appear in The Nation, a paper with a very small circulation compared to the New York Times, so his image of Sandino gets less exposure than Denny's image. However, Beals' series is later reprinted in some larger daily papers, and certainly, contributes to the construction, or at least, the debate about, Sandino's image in the United States.

Carleton Beals received a wire in early January 1928 from Oswald Garrison Villard, the editor of The Nation, asking him to go immediately to Nicaragua to write exclusive stories for the periodical. Villard wanted articles on American policy and the marine occupation as well as Nicaraguan public opinion on the subjects. Most importantly, Villard wanted Beals to secure the first interview of Sandino conducted by a US journalist (Britton, 1987).

Beals had spent much of the 1920s living in Mexico City observing the aftermath and institutionalization of the Mexican Revolution and developing relationships, both working and personal, with US liberals and leftists also living in Mexico City. During this period, Beals wrote several articles for various publications critical of US policy in Mexico, which Beals considered to be imperialistic. He also criticized US companies that failed to comply with Mexican law (Britton, 1987).

By the time Villard asked Beals to go to Nicaragua, Beals had long before formed an extremely dim view of US policy toward Mexico, in particular, and Latin America, in general. He knew of Sandino and had already wondered why the North American press had accepted "the official Washington propaganda line" that Sandino was a bandit and outlaw and had "made no attempt to get his side of the story" (Beals, 1965: 83). So, twenty minutes after receiving Villard's request, Beals sent a reply accepting the assignment (Beals, 1970).

Oswald Garrison Villard, grandson of abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison, became the sixth editor of The Nation in 1918 and bought the magazine in 1923. Under his direction, The Nation's circulation increased from 7,200 in 1918 to 38,000 copies in 1920 in spite of, or because of, numerous articles criticizing or exposing US policy and

action in post-World War I Europe and the Caribbean. Therefore, Villard's influence upon the construction of Sandino's image is critical as Beals' articles were reprinted in the New York Herald Tribune (a Hearst paper), El Sol in Madrid and other large and small newspapers in the US, Europe, and Asia, and they were translated into numerous languages (Beals, 1965). Villard looked upon the publication of Beals' interview with Sandino, and The Nation's other articles about the Caribbean, "with unbounded satisfaction," and as being worth "all the time and money I put into The Nation" (Villard, 1939: 485).

Beals begins his "With Sandino in Nicaragua" series by noting, with slight mockery directed toward the US marines, that he had not been harmed in all the time spent with Sandino's followers or in Sandino's camp in spite of the fact that he is Anglo-Saxon (Beals, 1928a). He then records Sandino's parting words to him. "'Tell your people,' he returned, 'there may be bandits in Nicaragua, but they are not necessarily Nicaraguans'" (Beals, 1928a: 204).

The above introductory paragraph to the series sets the tone for Beals' observations of Sandino, his followers and his cause. The first three parts of the series are simply a chronicle of Beals' difficult journey to reach Sandino and conduct the interview. However, along the way, Beals meets many of Sandinos' supporters and tells the story of how they are "risking all in the Sandino cause" as well as how he listened to their stories of American atrocities (Beals, 1928b: 233). As Beals is telling the story of his travels to meet with Sandino, he mentions that he passes through the Department of Nueva Segovia, which Sandino had declared to be a republic the previous day and where people call Sandino "'San Digno' - Worthy Saint'" (Beals, 1928b: 232). The statement

of Sandinista General Juan Colindres, reprinted verbatim in The Nation, allows a look into a loyal follower's view of Sandino's early interpretation of the events that lead him to revolt and that gave him the firm conviction that “the first duty of a patriotic Nicaraguan was to establish his country's sovereignty in the face of the world and make foreign invasion impossible" (Beals, 1928c: 261). At San Rafael del Norte, Beals learns from the townspeople that the Sandinistas are not the bandits that the marines say they are. Sandino’s first order upon arrival was that any of his men touching anything not belonging to him would be shot. The shopkeepers confirmed that the Sandinistas were absolutely orderly and paid for everything they wanted (Beals, 1928e: 316). Among Sandino’s soldiers, Beals reports that Sandino “has stimulated a fierce affection and a blind loyalty and has instilled his own burning hatred of the invader” (Beals, 1928d: 289). The author also observes that Sandino’s sayings are oft repeated by his army.

The last three articles of Beals' series tell of Sandino himself and largely present a positive picture of him although Beals is not averse to mentioning some negative impressions of the General. The Sandino presented by Beals to the American public is without vices, has a deep sense of justice, has a sincere concern for the welfare of every one of his soldiers, has a deeply spiritual side, is humble, does not seek personal gain and loves his country (Beals, 1928d). Beals also found Sandino to be very articulate and very ordered in his discussion of his mission. Sandino addressed all of Beals' questions forthrightly. However, while Beals found Sandino to be self-assured in military matters, he also described Sandino as "a bit flamboyant and boastful and with a tendency to exaggerate his successes" (Beals, 1928d: 314). In fact, Beals states that Sandino’s

accounts of battle results "are as exaggerated as those of the marines..." (Beals, 1928e: 340).

In describing Sandino's followers and the relationship they have with the General, Beals was positively impressed. He was particularly interested in discovering the truth behind US claims that Sandino is nothing more than a bandit taking advantage of and mistreating peasants and his followers across Nicaragua. Sandino explained to him several times that reports of banditry by his men were untrue. The General made a point of saying, in several ways, that he has never stolen, broken a promise, or been in financial debt. As Beals interviewed shopkeepers and peasants in the countryside, he found Sandino's claims to be true. He was told that Sandino's troops were always orderly and paid for everything they wanted (Beals, 1928d). Beals also experienced firsthand the generosity of Sandino's followers as they fed Beals while going without food themselves.

Sandino showed Beals the pledge that all of his soldiers must sign upon enlistment. The pledge is generally an agreement that the soldier will maintain the sovereignty of Nicaragua and protect its people, respect all civilians, maintain discipline, expect no salary, and obey Sandino. His point in showing Beals the pledge was to say that their cause is a moral obligation furthered by an army "composed of workers and peasants who love their country" (Beals, 1928e: 340). On the other hand, the United States uses protecting American lives and property as a pretext to extract wealth from Nicaragua, according to Sandino. Beals ends the last two articles with Sandino turning the tables on Washington. "...Send the bill [for the expenses of Sandino's army] to President Coolidge, who is to blame for this violation of my country," says the General

(Beals, 1928d: 317). Then Beals ends the series with Sandino arguing "We are no more bandits than Washington" (Beals, 1928e: 341).

New York Times reports of the Nicaraguan situation through the rest of 1928 include stories of marines searching for Sandinistas, marines defeating Sandinistas in battle, and General Lejeune predicting peace soon ("Gen. Lejeune Predicts..." 1928). By April 24th, Sandino has reappeared in northeastern Nicaragua and seizes two US-owned gold mines, one of which is owned by La Luz y Los Angeles Mining company, the company represented by Philander Knox and that formerly employed Adolfo Díaz ("Sandino Captures..." 1928). The next day Denny reports that Sandinistas have captured and murdered the assistant manager of the mine (Denny, 1928j).[34]

During this first half of the year, the image of Sandino and his followers put forth by US officials and presented in the New York Times is one of a man who is violent, unreasonable and arrogant if not somewhat deluded. Examples of these traits include the seizure of mines and the destruction done to them by the Sandinistas ("Raiders Dynamite Mines..." 1928; "Owners Say Mine is Wreck," 1928), implications that Sandinistas distributed flyers to Nicaraguans calling on them to kill Americans ("'Kill All Americans,'..." 1928) and the publication of a letter "purporting to be from Augustino Sandino" that contains "what amounts to a declaration of war against Americans individually" (Denny, 1928k: 4). As evidence of his arrogance, Denny reports that, after destroying the La Luz mine, Sandino declared that "he could gather 1,500 men whenever he wished and welcomed the fact that marines were on the way to the mines because they

[34] George Marshall apparently really died of malaria while in Sandinista hands (Macaulay, 1985).

would be where he wanted them and he could wipe them out whenever he wished" (Denny, 1928k: 4).

Another emphasis of reports on Nicaragua is that marines, specifically, and the US government, in general, must protect Nicaraguans. First, US officials continue to insist that US officials must supervise the Nicaraguan presidential election and to implement their plans to do so. In spite of the fact that the Nicaraguan Congress defeats a bill allowing American supervision of the election, President Diaz signs an executive decree ordering such supervision (Denny, 1928l; 1928m). Second, the US Marine Corps is now saying that it is the Corps' mission to "protect the welfare of the native population" (Denny, 1928n: 27). The mission previously was to protect US lives and property. These new orders come in response to accusations that the marines were destroying Nicaraguan property and visiting unjust treatment on Nicaraguans innocent of participating in Sandino's revolt.

Finally, a number of articles in 1928 discuss the economic relationship between the US and Nicaragua. Nicaragua requests a $6 million loan, but bankers await the outcome of the Nicaraguan elections ("Discuss Nicaragua Loan," 1928). By June the American official charged with customs collections in Nicaragua declares that customs revenues have increased in spite of the Liberal uprising and Sandino's revolt ("Nicaragua Had Gain..." 1928). Again, it seems that Sandino is of little consequence. Then Denny writes a lengthy article describing the large role that US bankers have played in the Nicaraguan economy. He reports that the relationship has been unsatisfactory for the bankers due to criticisms, originating from within Nicaragua and the United States, of the bankers' operations while being largely helpful to the Nicaraguans (Denny, 1928o). This

article provides for the reading public a logical explanation for the exit from Nicaragua of Brown Brothers and J & W Seligman that will occur in 1929.

As mentioned previously, Denny elaborates this theme in his 1929 book Dollars for Bullets. In the foreword of the book, Denny (1929b) states , "In Nicaragua the author visited every part of the Republic and came to know not only the chief figures in the many-sided struggle, but all classes of Nicaraguans of all shades of opinion..." Unfortunately, the author did not come to know Sandino nor did Denny interview him. Nevertheless, he includes a chapter about Sandino in which he credits Sandino with intelligence, an extraordinary personality that inspires devotion in others, "wild patriotism," and megalomania (1929b: 332). It seems that Denny recognizes Sandino's charismatic qualities. In this list, he also observes that perhaps the greatest significance of Sandino "was that he served as a focal point for all the undoubted dislike and jealousy and distrust in Latin America for the United States" (Denny, 1929: 336). However, any compliments to Sandino are far outweighed by Denny's defense of US economic and political *domination* (Denny's word, author's italics) of Nicaragua. According to Denny (1929b: 13):

> The real motives for America's moves...are rooted in the basic strategy of America's national defense...bolstered by America's one principle of foreign policy the Monroe Doctrine. However mistaken and blundering and unethical, or however righteous and magnanimous, has been the behavior of the United States in Nicaragua, it can be judged understandingly only in relation to those major considerations which have dictated it.

The image of Sandino created by United States diplomatic and military officials and the New York Times in 1927 and 1928 continues through the next several years of Sandino's revolution. Of course, the details of the image change somewhat, but the

characterization of Sandino in 1929 from these sources still labels him and his followers as bandits and emphasizes the idea that they are operating in disorganized, roving bands throughout the countryside ("Marines to Fight..." 1929; "Hunger Emboldens..." 1929; "Sandino Still a Peril..." 1929). These articles discredit Sandino by categorizing him as a common criminal and by suggesting he is a coward when they make statements like "The bandits never fight in the open" ("Hunger Emboldens..." 1929, 20). He is also discredited by the emphasis in 1929 articles on reported splits in Sandino's ranks ("Sandino Breaks with Turcios," 1929; "Says Aides Quit Sandino," 1929). Finally, newly elected President Moncada makes a point of saying that Sandino is a fanatic who has brought great destruction to Nicaragua and to himself ("Sandino Provokes..." 1929).

It is also in 1929 when Nicaraguan officials report that Sandino has left Nicaragua and has been welcomed into Mexico ("Nicaragua Asserts..." 1929; "Sandino Welcomed at Merida" 1929). Before going to Mexico, the Times gives some space to negative reaction to Sandino's vision for Nicaragua and Latin America. One article summarizes an editorial in an Argentine newspaper that designates Sandino's call for a Latin American congress to discuss Nicaragua's situation as a "Central American joke." ("Argentine Press Sees Sandino..." 1929: 6). While Sandino is in Mexico, the paper calls Sandino "the exiled Nicaraguan leader" and prints two stories about the Mexican communist party accusing Sandino of accepting a $60,000 bribe to leave Nicaragua ("Sandino Welcomed..." 1929: 4; "Investigate Story Sandino Took Bribe," 1929).

Meanwhile, the marines proclaim that peace is being successfully restored in Nicaragua due to the efforts of the marines with the support of the Nicaraguan National Guard and due to US supervision of "a free and fair election" ("Marines Proclaim..."

1929: 7). marine officials are moving to repatriate refugees to northern Nicaraguan where most fighting occurred and to begin reconstruction there while law enforcement is ever more turned over to Nicaraguans ("Plan Construction..." 1929; "Nicaraguans Plan..." 1929). Things are apparently so peaceful that General Feland could return to the US in May to report to Washington. He told reporters that Nicaragua "was never so peaceful and orderly as now" although it is still premature to withdraw the 3,500 marines occupying the country ("Gen. Feland Returns..." 1929: 27). By September a marine colonel returning to the US assures reporters that the peace in Nicaragua is permanent ("Peace in Nicaragua..." 1929). Harold Denny agrees that peace reigns in Nicaragua and credits Henry Stimson and General Frank McCoy, who supervised the elections, with ushering in this new era. Further, Denny states that "...whatever mistakes that the United States had made in the past in its dealings with Nicaragua, it at last had vindicated itself" (Denny, 1929a: IX, 1). Meanwhile, US investment bankers J & W Seligman and railroad manager JG White & Company resign their Nicaragua connections by the end of 1929. Reasons given for the severing of these relationships were disagreements with the Moncada government and small profits. It is unclear what role either Sandino or the October 1929 stock market crash had on these decisions (Buell, 1930b).

In spite of declarations of peace by US and Nicaraguan officials, criticisms of US policy continue from within the US although these viewpoints do not receive as many column inches in the New York Times as those that support United States policy. Democratic Senators continue to try to block funding that would keep the marines in Nicaragua and won one such battle in February 1929. Senator Dill of Washington had

the votes to block such funding as he and his supporters argued that the US "was imperialistic in its Nicaraugan policy" ("Senate Acts to Ban..." 1929: 1).

Perhaps the most stinging and surprising criticism of US policy in Nicaragua came at the end of 1929 from a Marine Corps general who had served in Nicaragua. General Smedley Butler, in line to one day become Marine Corps Commandant, was quoted in the Times as having said "The opposition candidates in Nicaragua were declared bandits when it became necessary to elect our man to office" ("Asks Gen. Butler..." 1929: 1). Navy officials immediately called Butler to Washington to explain his remarks, and others called for an inquiry into his claims that marines "were used to override the election laws of Nicaragua" and "force [the Nicaraguan population] to accept Marine-picked candidates" ("Call for Marine Inquiry" 1929: 3). Publicly, the government downplayed the incident and accepted Butler's explanation of it but did not divulge the content of his explanation in the paper ("May End Butler Incident" 1929; "Accepts Butler's Version" 1929).

General Smedley Butler had been involved in US military expeditions, including three missions to Nicaragua, from 1898 through the 1920s. He won two Congressional Medals of Honor and was very popular with the American public. His tendencies to be outspoken got him into trouble with the military and political establishments. After Butler criticized Nicaraguan elections, he was "passed over for the marine Corps commandancy" in spite of being the Corps' highest ranking officer (Schmidt, 1987: 1). In 1931 President Hoover ordered him court-martialed, but public outcry convinced the government to drop the charges (Schmidt, 1987; Thomas, 1933). Butler took great offense at the reprimand. "This is the first time in my service of thirty-two years that I've

ever been hauled on the carpet and treated like an unruly school boy. I haven't always approved of the actions of the administration, but I've always faithfully carried out my instructions," he told the Secretary of the Navy charged with issuing the reprimand (Schmidt, 1987: 300).

Butler retired soon after these incidents and became a spokesperson against the use of US military to protect US business interests overseas. In this capacity, Butler was even more outspoken and published War is a Racket (1935b) from which excerpts were reprinted in periodicals such as The Reader's Digest (1935a) and The Forum (1934). The thesis of Butler's book is that war is conducted so that a few may make huge fortunes from it while the general public pays the bill in terms of economic instability, death, injury and mental disorders. Specifically, he charges that business sells faulty or useless products or oversells to the government in wartime, and Butler cites numerous specific examples from World War I. In summary, Butler firmly believes that America's wars are fought to preserve Wall Street's interests at the expense of the American public and the populations of the countries where the wars occur.

January 1930 begins with the promised return of Sandino from Mexico to Nicaragua and assurances from US and Nicaraguan authorities that there is no cause for worry. Very brief articles quote Sandino saying, "'I will struggle against the United States intervention and dominion in Nicaragua as long as I have an atom of life in me...Only death will prevent me from returning to my country to terminate my duty there'" ("Sandino to Fight On" 1930: 10; "Sandino Plans Return," 1930). In May the Times reports rumors of Sandino's return but also makes a point of saying that "officials are not alarmed by the news" and that his return "will not materially affect the situation,

which is well controlled" ("Believe Sandino in Nicaragua" 1930; "Nicaragua Unstirred..." 1930: 15; "Sandino Fighting Again..." 1930).

One possible reason for downplaying Sandino's return to Nicaragua, in addition to simple arrogance, is that US attention is being drawn ever more to the restlessness in Europe. Fears of possible German takeover of Polish territories, Great Britain's hands-off policy on the matter, and French nervousness over the situation heightened the debate about US intervention in Latin America and the Caribbean as an effort at stabilization of those countries. The idea is that the US should intervene in this hemisphere and encourage political stability while building a middle class "to act in the nature of a shock absorber between the small group at the top and the countless peons at the bottom," as Whiting Williams puts it (Stark, 1930: 20). The result should then be a stable North and Latin America that can resist any attempted German onslaught.

Continuing this theme of the US encouraging and maintaining economic and political stability is an article by Raymond Leslie Buell (1930a). In this Times article, Buell tries to do away with racist stereotypes applied by North Americans to Latin Americans. Yet he also defends the North American intervention in Latin America, particularly in Nicaragua, as a necessity saying that US officials are operating efficiently and fairly. He offers this defense in spite of his admission that President Moncada's administration is the most repressive in Central America. Two papers written by Buell and published in Foreign Policy Reports add detail that, curiously, does not appear in the Times. In addition to arguing that US intervention is necessary, Buell criticizes that the US-sponsored election process is fair to Conservative and Liberal candidates but not to third party candidates, that it breeds a spirit of Nicaraguan servility to US wishes rather

than self-reliance and that no anti-American can become President of Nicaragua (Buell, 1930b & c). These points did not appear in the Times article read by a wider variety of North Americans than might read a foreign policy journal.

Marines to Withdraw

In 1931 pressure within the US to recall the marines increases dramatically ("Recall of Marines..." 1931). Concerns about the European situation are also increasing while the Great Depression deepens. Reports of marines being killed in Nicaragua continue, but the New York Times still supports marine occupation there ("Our Policy in Nicaragua," 1931: 16). Nevertheless, strong hints that the US government is changing its policy toward Nicaragua appear in January and February with stories that Secretary of State Henry Stimson has called the American Minister to Managua and the marine officer who commands the Nicaraguan National Guard to come to Washington ("Stimson To Discuss..." 1931; "Marines to Reduce..." 1931). Stimson finally makes the announcement in mid-February saying that the marines will be completely withdrawn from Nicaragua in 1932 with most leaving in the next few months ("Marines Will Quit Nicaragua..." 1931). Stimson's reported reasons for this change of mind are that there is no longer as much need for the marine presence because the National Guard is ready to take over and that he believes that it is simply "time for Nicaragua to clean up the bandit situation itself and be responsible for law and order in the republic" ("Marines Will Quit Nicaragua..." 1931: 3).

According to New York Times articles, reaction to Stimson's announcement is generally supportive in the US and filled with skepticism in Latin America. The Times, which voiced its continuing support of marine occupation on January third, publishes an

editorial on February fourteenth supportive of the withdrawal ("Withdrawing the Marines" 1931). It also reports a reversal of opinion for Nicaraguan officials who now support National Guard replacement of marines in spite of repeated published statements by Moncada that he wants the marines to stay ("Nicaragua favors Marine Withdrawal" 1931). A handful of Americans who have questioned or opposed the marine occupation now get the opportunity to also agree with Stimson. For example, Buell's analysis in the Times applauds the change in US policy as "an effort to improve Pan American relations" (Buell, 1931: IX, 7).

Unfortunately, a devastating earthquake destroys Managua on April 1, 1931 leaving over 1,000 dead and thousands injured ("Managua is Destroyed..." 1931). News of the earthquake becomes an opportunity to praise the US military and to discuss US business. After the initial news story is printed, other stories about the catastrophe focus on the aid given to Nicaragua by US Marines and Navy as well as the status of the approximately 2,500 US citizens in the country ("Ships at Canal..." 1931; "The Marines" 1931; "2,500 Americans..." 1931). A somewhat detailed description appears in the April 1 issue outlining the effects of the earthquake on the estimated $13,000,000 of American investments in Nicaragua ("Our Investments..." 1931, 3).

Meanwhile, plans for the marine withdrawal continue. Several articles quote Stimson saying that the marines will leave combat areas by June and warning US citizens that the US government will no longer offer protection to them if they choose to remain in Nicaragua ("Despite New Clash,..." 1931; Oulahan, 1931; "Stimson Issues Warning" 1931). Stimson then has to spend much time defending the new policy against what he calls "misinterpretation" indicated by a storm of criticism that the Hoover administration

has abandoned Americans ("Stimson Defends Change..." 1931; 1). One of Stimson's arguments for the withdrawal is that the problem in Nicaragua is different than it was in 1926 when the troubles began. At that time, he says, the two opposing armies were abiding by the rules of warfare. However, now, "the menace is from outlaws under General Sandino who are moving through the jungle upon scattered settlements, bent upon murdering and looting" ("Stimson Defends Change..." 1931: 1).

In addition to Stimson's implication that the marines are pulling out because Sandino does not fight fairly, reports to the US public continue to paint Sandino as unreasonable, violent, and elusive. A letter said to be written by Sandino is published and threatens that "in order to save Nicaragua, it is necessary to destroy it "exemplifying his unreasonable and violent streak" ("Threatens to Burn..." 1931: 2). Denny (1931: 12) writes a feature article chronicling Sandino's activities since Tipitapa dismissively calling Sandino's efforts "another 'bamboo battle'...in that unimportant little area in the most backward corner of Central America..." Within the article, Denny notes how Sandino has managed to suddenly become an "international problem" and elude marines for four years (Denny, 1931: 12). Furthermore, Sandino's forces are taking advantage of problems in the Moncada administration, capturing or threatening US business concerns, and killing Americans ("Sandino Rebels Take Port..." 1931; "Thirty Reported Killed" 1931; Denny, 1931). President Hoover publicly states his support for the new policy and expresses confidence that the Nicaraguan government will bring Sandino, who "has placed himself outside the civilized pale," to justice ("Hoover Denounces Sandino..." 22 April 1931: 1).

In 1932 editions, Sandino again promises to continue his fight until the marines have gone, and the US government continues to promise withdrawal of the marines by

January 2, 1933 ("Sandino is Reported..." 1932; "Sandino Tells of Battles," 1932; "Date Fixed for Ending..." 1932). More specifically, Sandino is reported to have said that upon the withdrawal of the marines, "he will convert Nicaragua into a 'land of bandits'...since he is called a bandit..." and Nicaraguan coffee planters are leaving their plantations in fear of the rebels ("Sandino Voices Threat," 1932: 6; "Nicaraguan Planters Quit" 1932). On the other hand, December and the imminent departure of the marines bring suggestions from a Sandino supporter that Sandino will make peace with Sacasa in 1933 and that Sacasa will likely adopt Sandino's proposed policies (Calhoun, 1932).

Other than continuing to present Sandino in the now standard ways, articles appear that praise the abilities of the Nicaraguan National Guard. Such comments have appeared periodically over the years, but in 1932 the Guard is touted in the Times as a "model little army" (“Nicaraguan Guard..." 1932: III, 8). By December, the US marine officers who have been commanding the Guard are replaced by Nicaraguans ("Natives Take Over..." 1932). News that will become of utmost importance later is also offered. An extremely brief article reports that "General Anastasio Somosa [sic] has been appointed assistant chief of the Guardia Nacional to assume the office of chief...when the United States marines depart...he...has always been friendly to Americans..." ("Somosa [sic] to Head..." 1932: 4).

The other prominent news of 1932 is that American supervised elections have again been held, and Juan B. Sacasa is the new president. The election is reported to have occurred without major disturbances, and a Times editorial takes a paternalistic tone and says that "the United States...has taught Nicaraguans how to hold an election" ("Nicaragua's Election," 1932: 18). Furthermore, US officials seem to congratulate

themselves as one proclaims that Nicaraguans consider the election to have been conducted legally and efficiently, in freedom and fairness and without bias ("Constructive Era..." 1932).

Sandino "Gives Up"

Within days of the departure of the last of the marines, rumors of Sandino's wish to make peace appear in the New York Times in January and the paper covers his visit to Managua in February ("Sandino to Yield Arms..." 1933; "Sandino Seeks Peace," 1933; "Sandino Proposes Truce" 1933; "Sandino Visits Managua," 1933). In reporting the withdrawal of the last marines on January 2, the lengthy Times article never mentions Sandino, implying that their departure has nothing to do with his struggle against them ("Washington Ends Task..." 1933; "Last of Marines..." 1933). Sandino's appearance in Managua on February 2 is reported ("Sandino Visits Managua," 1933).

During the efforts of Sandino and Sacasa to negotiate, Sandino is characterized by a New York Times writer as a "Nicaraguan outlaw for more than five years" who had come to the capital to make peace ("Sandino Emerges..." 1933: 1). However, Sandino is not characterized as a peacemaker. Instead, the Sandinistas are characterized as "give[ing] up" ("1,800 Sandinistas..." 1933: 16). Additionally, a Times editorial boldly states, "It was the carrying out of Mr. Hoover's policy that stabilized Nicaragua and prepared the way for the submission of Sandino" ("Sandino Submits," 1933: 14). This statement appears in spite of the fact that the marines left Nicaragua before Sandino comes to negotiate peace and that they left without defeating Sandino.

As negotiations continue between Sandino and the government, a front page story in the New York Times reports that Sandino, along with three of his aides, has been

"suddenly seized and executed" by the Nicaraguan National Guard ("Sandino is Killed..." 1934: 1). Sandino and his party had been leaving the presidential palace in Managua when they were seized, forced into a truck, taken to the airport and shot by guardsmen. The story makes a point of saying that President Sacasa is not implicated in the killings and that the Nicaraguan government condemns the killings as acts of individual guardsmen. Most importantly to the construction of Sandino in the US, the Times also implies that Sandino brought his murder on himself when it says that his criticism of the National Guard irritated Guard members.

A biography of Sandino printed on page four of the same issue seems to paint Sandino as a bit of a romantic but pathetic figure with its headline "Leader of Lost Causes" (1934: 4). This biography finally corrects a few errors about Sandino, such as his age, that have appeared previously. On the other hand, it perpetuates the report that he served under Pancho Villa. A summary of his struggle against United States domination and marine occupation of Nicaragua is explained in about two and a half column inches. The last half of the article is devoted to telling his activities since the marines left the country. For example, it recounts the agreement made with the Sacasa government that 100 of Sandino's followers be given government financial help to begin a cooperative farming project. Sandino, in turn, surrendered most of his arms and promised to refrain from seeking office. Finally, the story reports that reaction from some of Sandino's followers has been to call for immediate reorganization of the Guard.

Other stories in the February 23 issue outline the military struggle between Sandino and the marines emphasizing the marine point of view by telling that 130 marines were killed in the five and a half years of Sandino's revolt ("Marines Hunted

Sandino 5 Years," 1934). It also explains that the number of occupying marines varied with the degree of "banditry and Sandino's bushwhacking operations" ("Marines Hunted..." 1934: 4). Another article calls Sandino a "popular hero" in Latin America (“Salvador Is Indignant" 1934; 4). A third article discusses the possible dangers to Nicaraguan peace and the possible assassination of President Sacasa ("Sacasa Is Declared..." 1934). Interestingly, a fourth article warns of possible revolution following Sandino's murder while also noting that General Somoza, commander of the Guard, is former President Moncada's nephew ("Revolt Is Predicted" 1934).

In the aftermath of Sandino's assassination, widespread violent revolt does not erupt in Nicaragua. Nevertheless, the sum of stories involving the murder seem to imply repeatedly that Sandino somehow deserved it or brought it on himself. At first, President Sacasa blames the killing on poor management of the National Guard, and reports say that the guilty Guardsmen will be executed immediately ("Nicaraguan Guard Blamed..." 1934; "Guardsmen to Die..." 1934). Three days after the killing, an explanation is offered for the killlings saying that guardsmen who went to Sandino's residence encountered gunfire, returned the fire and killed Sandino's brother and then kidnapped and killed Sandino ("War Council To Act..." 1934). A week after the murders, stories appear accusing Sandino of plotting a revolt against the Sacasa government. In addition, the New York Times reports that Nicaraguan newspapers blame Sandino for his own murder because he did not surrender weapons and criticized the Guard ("Sandino Accused..." 1934). Finally, there is a story that a National Guard unit, searching a farming community, found a large numbers of weapons and letters belonging to

Sandino's group showing that he "was laying the foundation through propaganda for a Communist State" ("Arms Cache Found..." 1934).

The Somozas Rise to Power

Meanwhile, Sacasa takes more direct control of the National Guard in an attempt to curtail Somoza's power, but his control is short-lived as the guardsmen accused of Sandino's murder are cleared of all charges, and by August receive amnesty from the Nicaraguan Chamber of Deputies ("Sacasa Directs Guard" 1934; "Cleared in Sandino Death" 1934; "Killers of Sandino..." 1934). Earlier in the summer, Somoza has expressed his interest in becoming president, and a news story quotes Sandino's mother as supporting him but also mentions that Sandino's father accused Somoza of their son's murder ("Sandino's Mother..." 1934). Moncada has also boldly and publicly expressed his approval of Sandino's murder as an act of patriotism ("Moncada Rejoices..." 1934).

A somewhat critical analysis in the Times of the aforementioned articles published after Sandino's death looks at explanations of Sandino's death as "numerous and often amusingly absurd" ("Varied Tales Told..." 1934: 8). It highlights the "campaign in the Nicaraguan press to justify the elimination of General Sandino" but does not analyze similar stories and presentations in the New York Times. This story goes so far as to question the authenticity of the letter from Sandino's mother that endorses Somoza for president. What the story fails to mention in its analysis is that the New York Times itself places stories like Sandino's mother backing Somoza for president on page one while relegating the story of Sacasa blaming the Guard for the murder to page twenty-two. Of more interest is that a story buried on page forty-four telling of the

release of the particular guardsman accused of Sandino's murder was by order of the United States Secretary of Labor ("Man Named as Killer..." 1934).

Even though Sandino is dead, the image of a violent Sandino and violent followers continues. Brief Times reports in 1935 focus on National Guard pursuit of Sandino's followers because the Guard says that the Sandinistas are looting and torturing plantation owners ("Bandit is Active Again" 1935). In particular, the paper reports pursuit of Sandino's general Pedro Altamirano and emphasizes his cruelty by crediting him with inventing the "cut of the coat," a practice of cutting off the arms of victims either while killing them or after killing ("Bandit is Active Again," 1935: 8).

While Sandino's followers are still reported hunted in 1936, the emphasis in the New York Times is on Somoza's activities to take over the Nicaraguan government. First, Somoza and his Guardsmen take control of the east coast of the country as well as four major towns because, Somoza says, the move was necessary to prevent disturbances ("Army Rebels Hold...Towns," 1936). Specifically, Guard spokesmen say that the people of the country are unhappy because a political agreement has left the selection of the next Liberal party presidential candidate solely to President Sacasa and General Emiliano Chamorro ("Nicaragua Army..." 1936). Meanwhile, the Sacasa government accuses Somoza of replacing civil authorities with his own supporters in order to ensure Somoza's candidacy ("Nicaragua Army..." 1936). However, Somoza denies that his actions are aimed toward taking over the government but instead are to calm public agitation resulting from popular discontent with the current government and electoral procedure ("Army Head Denies..." 1936). Nevertheless, days after this denial, the Times reports guardsmen unsuccessfully attacking the presidential palace with machine guns

after Somoza "replaced virtually all civil authorities with National Guardsmen" ("Nicaraguan Guard Balked in Battle..." 1936: 6).

The next day, Somoza releases a statement declaring that he controls Nicaragua, not only in a geographic sense, but also banking and infrastructure ("Managua is Tense..." 1936). Within a few more days, Somoza overtakes Leon and the Sacasa government succumbs and goes into exile ("Nicaraguan Fort..." 1936; "Sacasa Betrayed..." 1936). Interestingly, the Times reports that the United States' newly formed policy of non-interference in the domestic affairs of American nations is reaffirmed and fully in force, according to Secretary of State Cordell Hull ("Washington Shuns..." 1936). As expected, Somoza wins the nomination for president as a candidate of the Liberal party, and this particular story notes that Somoza "easily seized power" in Nicaragua a month prior to his nomination ("Nicaraguans Choose..." 1936: 17). Three months later, a very brief column announces that Somoza has published his book *El verdadero Sandino* (The True Sandino) and that it contains information taken from Sandino's archives. The Times paraphrases Somoza's claim that Sandino's own archives show that Sandino was plotting an overthrow of the Sacasa government and planned to establish communism ("Issues Book on Sandino" 1936). The article does not question the validity of Somoza's claims in any way; it seems to accept the statements about Sandino as fact.

President Anastasio Somoza was assassinated in September 1956, and his killer, Rigoberto López Pérez, was immediately shot and killed. The two New York Times articles telling of Somoza's death emphasize his complete control of Nicaragua and call him a dictator but also call him "extremely popular with many of his countrymen" (Kennedy, 1956; "Somoza's Nation..." 1956: 3). In recounting Somoza's life, the Times

mentions that Somoza's political career began in Moncada's government as Minister of War and later became Commander of the National Guard. As it tells this story, it notes that the US Marines and the National Guard fought a "long and bitter struggle against a diminutive and extremely elusive revolutionary leader, Augusto Cesar Sandino" ("Somoza's Nation ..." 1956: 3). It further states that Sandino was executed by National Guardsmen, noting that Somoza was the Guard Commander, but attributing no blame to Somoza for the killing. The picture of Somoza here is that he stabilized a country racked by revolution and political upheaval even though his exercise of power was somewhat heavy-handed and that he was an energetic and enjoyable fellow. President Dwight Eisenhower praised Somoza as a constant friend of the United States who was murdered in a "dastardly attack" ("Eisenhower Expresses Regret..." 1956: 3).

In a look back at United States involvement in the Sandino revolt, Marine Corps historian Bernard Nalty reinforces the now familiar image of Sandino as constructed by US officials, military and journalists but also identifies specifically charismatic characteristics. Nalty (1962: 17) notes that Sandino was a bandit and outlaw but also says that he "was more than an outlaw." According to Nalty, Sandino was a "zealot," a "fanatic," an "inspirational leader" and the "most feared man in Nicaragua" (1962: 16, 29). Nalty said that his followers were under "his magic spell," and also characterized them as "fiercely loyal to Sandino" (1962: 17, 25). He also referred to the followers as "extremists" and several times as "Sandino's horde" yet conceded that they fought under "superb discipline" (1962: 21, 32). The article also contains an admission that US officials failed to understand and take seriously Sandino's military strength as well as the zeal of his followers.

Nalty's history features marine activities in Nicaragua but includes some political analysis as well. He admits that the Coolidge administration did not favor the Liberals and the original Sacasa government of 1926 because they "began imposing annoying taxes on American firms" (1962: 13). Then he says that the killing of an American and perceived threat to American lives and property convinced Coolidge to send military force and to sell arms to the Diaz government. At the end of the article, Nalty considers what the US accomplished with this intervention. He believes that the US actions did, in fact, protect American lives and property, improved financial stability in Nicaragua and kept the Europeans from becoming involved. Yet, the marines failed to bring peace to Nicaragua because "Sandino's die-hards were never brought to task" (1962: 34). Furthermore, he notes the intervention offended many Latin Americans all over the hemisphere to the detriment of US policy. Nevertheless, he believes that the marines left two great legacies - the National Guard and electoral law - but that neither survived due to Somoza's dictatorship. An important achievement of the intervention for Nalty was that the marines gained experience put to good use in World War II and that marine airmen and infantry learned to work as a team.

Twenty years after Henry Stimson brokered the peace agreement in Nicaragua, fourteen years after Sandino's murder, and after eleven years of Somoza's dictatorship, Stimson publishes a new account of Nicaraguan events and his view of Nicaraguans including Sandino. The North American who contributed heavily to the constructed image of Nicaragua and of Sandino in the US shows no real change in his opinion in 1947. He continues to believe that Nicaraguans wanted the US to mediate the war and supervise elections. He repeats that he was very favorably impressed with Moncada. He

states that the marines came to Nicaragua to save lives and that they did a good job (Stimson & Bundy, 1947).

.For Stimson, Sandino remains a disruptive force to Nicaraguan peace and US activities in the country and also remains an essentially bad man. He uses "bandit leader" in reference to Sandino and still cites Sandino's alleged history of banditry in Mexico. Sandino was simply "one of the Liberal leaders who failed to honor his personal pledge" to disarm (Stimson & Bundy, 1947: 114). Stimson views Sandino's Nicaraguan support as small but that he gained uncritical support in other parts of Latin America and the US. The view of Sandino that remains for Stimson is that he was "plainly unprincipled and brutal" and that, while Sandino was "a skillful guerrilla," the "violence and irresponsibility" of his activities, "helped to destroy his reputation as a great patriot" (Stimson & Bundy, 1947: 183). So, the official largely responsible for the image of Sandino presented to the American public leaves Sandino as the bloodthirsty bandit who was somewhat isolated from his own people but who was ultimately, and rightly, vanquished by US efforts to pacify Nicaragua.

The United States on Sandino

The North American presentation of Augusto César Sandino, detailed in Chapter Five, is quite distinct from the presentation offered by Sandino, his followers, and sympathizers. The New York Times' first mention of Sandino is on May 14, 1927 as it reports that all Liberal generals except for Sandino have signed the Tipitapa agreement. In that article, Henry Stimson characterizes him as a local problem and a bandit who will be handled by the US Marines and the native constabulary. That characterization will remain throughout Sandino's struggle, but other characteristics will be added as well.

Periodically, articles or editorials criticize US intervention in Nicaragua, but these articles are very much in the minority.

From May 1927 through January 1928, the presentation of Sandino by US government officials and the US military, as told to the New York Times, will be of a man who is acting far outside the norm for Nicaraguans and for civilized people. He is also largely treated as a nuisance of troublesome but little consequence. In July 1927 articles alone, Sandino is defiant and in rebellion against the government of Nicaragua. He is an outlaw isolated among his own people, a bandit, and a bloodthirsty coward. Sandino preys on the country and terrorizes his own people as he is a cold-blooded, cruel predator. Furthermore, he is a braggart who is only a hero to a horde of malcontents. These images persist in articles published after July, but another important characteristic is added in October. The Times suggests that Sandino is likely a Bolshevik since he spent time in Mexico. By January 1928 he becomes petty, self-centered and has an uncontrollable temper.

After January 1928 and until January 1933, the constructions of Sandino in the Times turn from casting him as an outlaw pest to treating him as more of a force, albeit a small force, with which the marines must contend. Essentially, the marines must begin to explain why they have not contained or defeated Sandino yet. He is called elusive and wily but suffers great military defeats while still having all of the negative personality characteristics above. In 1929, Sandino is also becoming an international issue and is the focal point of Latin American dislike and distrust of the US. He is a threat to US business in 1931. Finally, Sandino is a bandit who will ruin the entire country of Nicaragua.

Discussion of Sandino changes again in January 1933 with the marine withdrawal. One article does say that he seeks peace. However, other articles dismiss any role he may have played in the decision to withdraw the marines. In fact, stories of the withdrawal do not generally speak of Sandino at all, implying that the withdrawal has nothing to do with Sandino's efforts. When not ignored, the Times articles say that Sandino gave up his fight and, therefore, lost.

After Sandino's murder, stories imply that Sandino brought his murder on himself as he criticized the Guard. In reviewing who he was, they mention that he was a bandit and was running bushwhacking operations. Once Somoza takes over the Nicaraguan presidency in 1936, articles explain that the US has adopted a non-interventionist policy toward Nicaragua and will not, therefore, address Somoza's ousting of President Sacasa. After Somoza is assassinated in 1956, the paper reports that Somoza brought stability to Nicaragua.

Sandino, History & Charisma

The construction of Nicaraguan history and of Sandino is quite present-oriented, at least as it is presented in the New York Times. What historical construction there is casts Nicaragua as a rather politically and economically immature place that has not been able to solve its own problems and thus needs US guidance. Stimson notes that the US has periodically lent assistance. US Senator Wheeler and sociologist Whiting Williams offer minority voices to counter the State Department's and US military's construction as they identify a history of US economic and cultural penetration into Nicaragua.

Any recognition of Sandino's charismatic qualities is generally left to The Nation's Carleton Beals. Beals remarks on the devotion of Sandino's followers, the risks

they bear, their willingness to forego material reward and the fact that they are not coerced or mistreated. He also notes Sandino's deep sense of justice, devotion to his cause and his followers and his disinterest in personal gain. Quite surprisingly, the New York Times reporter Harold Denny does take note one time of Sandino's charismatic traits. He mentions that Sandino has an extraordinary personality, inspires devotion in others, is wildly patriotic and is a megalomaniac

In charismatic terms, wildly patriotic can mean that he is devoted to his mission, and megalomania can be authoritative and single-minded from a follower's perspective.

The construction of Sandino by US officials and reporters is generally one-dimensional, with some exceptions, and does not grant Sandino much of a personal history. The one feature of Sandino's background that is mentioned several times by US officials is that he lived in Mexico and made revolutionary and Bolshevik ties there. This feature is one of many that demonstrate that Sandino is a bad man. Clearly, a one-dimensional, ahistorical Sandino suits North American purposes nicely. A complex enemy is more confusing and demands more consideration than does a simply bad man. On the other hand, the US presentation of Sandino does contain some contradictions whereas Somoza García's construction of Sandino will not, in any way, allow contradictions. Sandino is simply evil.

CHAPTER VI

SANDINO'S OFFICIAL DECLINE: SOMOZA & HIS OFFICIAL CONSTRUCTION OF NICARAGUAN HISTORY

As quickly as he could after Sandino's death, Anastasio Somoza García presents his construction of recent Nicaraguan history to the literate public. In 1936 Somoza publishes his version of the struggle between Sandino, the United States Marines and the Nicaraguan National Guard in a book entitled El verdadero Sandino o el calvario de Las Segovias (The True Sandino or the Calvary of Las Segovias). This construction of Sandino's struggle is extensive with numerous supporting documents, including many from files taken from Sandinista archives. Not surprisingly, Somoza continues the North American image construction of Sandino by emphasizing the rebel General as violent and a bandit. In addition, Somoza extends the US presentation of Augusto Sandino by also characterizing the General as vain, of poor character, and a traitor.

Anastasio Somoza García was born in 1896 to Anastasio Somoza Reyes and his wife, Julia García. Tacho's (Somoza García's nickname) father was a member of the Conservative party, even serving as a Conservative senator, although the previous generation had Liberal affiliations. Apparently, Tacho's father was even a signatory on the Bryan-Chamorro treaty. Nevertheless, Tacho decided to become a Liberal. However, Somoza was sent to study at a business school in the United States in order to keep him out of trouble after he confessed to getting one of the family maids pregnant.

While in the US, he learned to speak English very well, learned American culture including slang, and met Salvadora Debayle, who was Juan Bautista Sacasa's niece and would become Tacho's wife. Somoza held a number of jobs to support himself and his new wife. He was a car salesman, a sports referee, an electric meter reader, a toilet inspector, and a counterfeiter. His lack of success and/or interest at any of these jobs led him to consider politics and the military as the Constitutionalist war began in 1926. His fortunes improved when Henry Stimson came to Nicaragua to convince Moncada to sign the Tipitapa treaty. Stimson took Somoza as his interpreter, which led to Somoza becoming President Moncada's aide. Somoza managed to earn Moncada's trust by helping him to cover his indiscretions with women, and he also managed to establish a positive relationship with the Marines. When Managua suffered the earthquake, Somoza took advantage of the situation by inciting a transportation strike and then negotiating the settlement of it. Somoza's greatest opportunity came when Salvadora's uncle, Juan Bautista Sacasa, was elected president of Nicaragua, and the US marines withdrew shortly thereafter. Of course, the Marines left after training the National Guard to take their place and after training their newly appointed chief, Anastasio Somoza García (Diederich, 1989; Walter, 1993).

Sandino was a man of "violent character" and "violent temperament," according to Somoza García (1976: 33, 34). The author of El verdadero Sandino assures readers that Sandino's men carried out numerous cold-blooded murders with the approval of Sandino himself (Somoza García, 1976). In order to provide evidence of not only the murderous tendencies of Sandino but of his brutality, Somoza includes in the book "many photographs of Sandino's victims so that one can see the inhuman way in which

they were killed" (Somoza García, 1976: 70). Of the 134 photographs included in the book, twenty-six of them depict dead or maimed persons whose death or injuries Somoza attributes to the Sandinistas. Many of the pictures of cadavers show dismembered or decapitated bodies. Supplementing the twenty-six pictures of cadavers, other photos taken while their subjects were still living have captions saying that the person in the photo was ultimately murdered by Sandinista forces.

El verdadero Sandino includes various testimonies by alleged victims of Sandino and/or his forces in order to make Somoza's points about the violence, insensitivity and capricious nature of the Sandinistas. For example, José María Siles, "full of horror," tells Somoza how a Sandinista bandit patrol murdered his father, early in the morning, by several machete blows to the head (Somoza García, 1976: 130). Apparently, Sandinistas had threatened the family earlier due to the father's participation in helping locally with the election of 1928. There is also the story of Rubén Brown, who, "at great risk," tells how he was held prisoner by Sandinistas and forced to teach children in spite of the fact that he was unqualified. At times, he was denied food and clothing. Finally, he was moved to Sandino's camp and became a cook where Sandino's wife, Blanca Aráuz, befriended him. Brown continues that one day Sandino simply called for four men to shoot Brown for no clear reason until Doña Blanca intervened with her husband and saved Brown's life (Somoza García, 1976: 278).

Immediately after relating Rubén Brown's story, Somoza reinforces his point about Sandino's bloodthirsty character by describing Sandinsta methods of killing their victims. These methods are shocking and meant to shock by their cruelty. For example, the *corte de chaleco* (vest cut) involves cutting off the victims' head and then the arms

just below the shoulders. Lastly, a cut is made across the abdomen to show where the bottom of a vest would fall. The *corte de cumba* (bloomer cut) was achieved by cutting off the victims' legs just below the knees and allowing the victim to bleed to death. Somoza says that these killing methods were conceived by Sandino and his general, Pedro Altamirano, "of whose satanic invention the authors can boast" (Somoza García: 1976: 280).

Somoza also presented Sandino as an extremely vain man. "Sandino wanted at all costs," Somoza writes (1976: 46), "to draw public attention to his name." Somoza provides the example of Sandino's renaming of the small town of El Jícaro to Ciudad Sandino and statement of Sandino's intent to make the town the capital of the future Republic of Nueva Segovia.

Publicity was a major weakness for Sandino, argues Somoza (1976). According to him, the propaganda spread by Sandino and his followers was largely composed of lies constructed to lead people, especially outside Nicaragua, to think that Sandino was more successful militarily than he actually was and that he had more followers than he actually did. He argues that it was the propaganda that was successful. It succeeded in turning Sandino into a "legendary figure" (Somoza, 1976: 88).

Perhaps most importantly, Somoza discredits the famous interview of Sandino by North American journalist Carleton Beals. He admits that the interview had a tremendous impact on North American public opinion toward sympathizing with Sandino's cause. However, Somoza (1976: 82) writes that Sandino told Beals many "stories of pure invention," and that Beals was in no position to sort out the truth as he only spent a few days with Sandino.

Numerous words and accusations used by Somoza García in El verdadero Sandino create an image of Sandino as a man seriously lacking in morals and good judgment. For example, Somoza notes that Sandino is not a reflective individual. This characterization suggests that he is incapable of judging his own actions and, therefore, incapable of admitting mistakes and expressing regret. It makes Sandino seem amoral. This idea of an amoral Sandino is also suggested by Somoza when the author relates stories such as Somoza's version of the battle at Ocotal. "Sandino fled leaving behind the body of his brave follower [Rufo Marín]...," writes Somoza (1976: 51) thus suggesting cowardice, insensitivity, and a lack of loyalty on Sandino's part.

Somoza makes much of the idea that Sandino is extremely distrustful of everyone around him, and his examples conjure an image of a paranoid man. The author relates that Sandino went to bed late, slept very little and awoke before his men because he was so distrustful. Somoza says that Sandino would usually prepare his bed in one place and sleep in another, which varied night to night, to avoid treachery by his own men. According to Somoza, Sandino did not trust his own personal staff and would routinely read their personal mail.

The image of Sandino exercising poor judgment largely rests on Somoza's criticism of Sandino for waging any war at all against the United States Marines and the Nicaraguan National Guard. Somoza (1976: 43) calls Sandino's fight "Quixote-esque." The author also mentions that there were opportunities for peace constantly offered to Sandino that included offers of amnesty for his soldiers and himself, and Sandino foolishly, stubbornly and repeatedly rejected such offers.

Finally, Somoza García casts Sandino as a traitor and therefore, casts Sandino's struggle as illegitimate. In Somoza's presentation of the issue, General Moncada was the great patriot who put aside his own selfish interests for the good of the country and signed the agreement with US representative Stimson. Here, Moncada wanted to avoid a war that he knew would be disastrous for Nicaragua. However, Moncada also set aside any quest for an heroic place in the nation's history books. "I have no wishes for immortality, that is to say, I don't want to be a second Zeledón," he quotes Moncada (Somoza García, 1976: 23).

On the other hand, Somoza (1976: 37) calls Sandino a "triple traitor." He became a traitor to the Liberal party, a traitor to his commander General Moncada and a traitor to Nicaragua when he refused to abide by the Tipitapa agreement negotiated by Moncada, a legitimate military authority in Somoza's view. He argues that, as a traitor, Sandino was always looking for excuses to continue the fighting. First, Sandino continued the war because he said that he would not accept Adolfo Díaz as president. Later, he said he was fighting against foreign intervention and even later, that he would continue to fight because the newly elected president General Moncada was the traitor. Then Sandino said that he would continue because the Nicaraguan National Guard was a creation of the United States. By 1933, Somoza (1976: 36) argues, Sandino continued in his assaults and murders of defenseless Nicaraguans in spite of the fact that Díaz, Moncada, the US marines and the US National Guard officials had all left the scene.

When the second edition of Somoza García's book was published in 1976, a new prologue not only called Sandino a bandit and a violent, savage man, but emphasized and elaborated Somoza's implications that Sandino was mentally unbalanced. The prologue's

author, Francisco A. Mendieta, claimed that Sandino's mental problems were caused by his involvement with spiritism, his dabbling with eastern beliefs in karma, his adherence to theosophy, and a belief in clairvoyance. Mendieta (Somoza, 1976: VIII) states, "And simply, [Sandino] was a crazy man who had the opportunity to bathe his own country in blood and desolation, while he roamed free."

According to Mendieta, Sandino's main mental problem was megalomania. The writer (Somoza, 1976: I, V) claims that Sandino "believed himself predestined to defeat the most powerful army in the world" and that he was "the greatest hero of the Americas, the champion of Indo-hispanic freedom, defender of the sovereignty of Nicaragua..." So he does recognize here what Sandino believed about himself. Mendieta's image of Sandino rests on the belief that Sandino's desire and intent was to become the only and ultimate political and military authority in Nicaragua. Therefore, Mendieta can easily explain Sandino's fate. "The inevitable happened. He had to disappear because otherwise, Nicaragua would fall into the most tremendous chaos brought on by the Sandinista hordes," concludes the prologue (Somoza, 1976: iv).

Another firsthand account written by a former National Guardsman gives some support to Somoza's argument but also credits Sandino with significant accomplishment. Domingo Ibarra Grijalva's book The Last Night of General Augusto C. Sandino chronicles the Sandinista revolt from its beginnings at Tipitapa in 1927 to Sandino's

murder in early 1934.[35] Ibarra (1973: vii) was an officer in the National Guard for fifteen years but resigned and then went to live in "exile...as an open adversary of the political and military regime of Anastacio [sic] Somoza."

As have others, like Sandino's representative to the peace talks, Ibarra discusses Sandino's intelligence. He says that Sandino's peasant mother taught him to read, and he, of course, never had the opportunity for higher learning. Ibarra mentions that, during the Constitutionalist War, Sandino's intellect was no match for the other officers in Moncada's Liberal Army who were physicians, lawyers, engineers, and journalists. In fact, Ibarra (1973: 194) says that the General had a "mentality a bit less than mediocre" and was not a politician. "But Sandino," he writes, "who was a novice at war, had something which those who surrendered their weapons lacked" (Ibarra, 1973: 53). Apparently, the "something" is a combination of courage, an unwillingness to compromise, and a disinterest in personal reward, and Sandino always expresses these qualities with eloquence and determination. Additionally, Ibarra notes that Sandino (1973: 42) issued numerous communiqués during the war and that "some were very inspiring and some were absurd." He says that the absurd ones were written by Sandino, and the others were written by Sandino's more learned advisors. Nevertheless, Ibarra (1973: 43) asserts that Sandino's intellectual mistakes are extremely insignificant compared to his status of "unimpeachable patriot" and his accomplishment of

[35] Ibarra does not publish his book until 1973, almost 20 years after the murder of Sandino. Therefore, his testimony is offered after years of considering the subject and not during the period of the murder and Somoza's ascent to power. Nevertheless, it is a firsthand account that corraborates some of Somoza's claims while also recognizing the charisimatic leadership of General Sandino.

"challenge[ing] the colossus reverberated throughout the world," and "today he is the symbol of the resistance of a people against all foreign domination." Clearly, Ibarra very much admires his former enemy.

Ibarra expresses his admiration for some of Sandino's officers and his extreme abhorrence of others. The author admires General Ortéz as brave, honest and very intelligent. On the other hand, Ibarra (1973: 19, 23) describes Major Sergeant Marcial Rivera Zeledón as a "cruel assassin, rapist and arsonist" and Generals Pedro Altamirano, Simón González and Pedro Antonio Irías as "human tigers" who "inhaled with enjoyment the odor of the blood and licked their lips with delight at seeing the wounds of their victims." However, of Sandino, Ibarra (1973: 24) says more than once that Sandino never spilled any blood except in combat, "fighting like a soldier, exposing his own life on the battlefields."

In spite of his admiration for Sandino and his distaste for Somoza's methods and intentions, Ibarra attributes some blame to Sandino for his own assassination. He outlines an argument similar to one that Somoza makes saying that Sandino was deceitful as he negotiated peace while at the same time he made a "public and well defined decision of using arms to again re-light the war" and that he wanted to take that war to all of Central America (Ibarra, 1973: 197). The Central American Union would have its own army, headed by Sandino. Coupled with the criticisms that the National Guard is unconstitutional, the belief that Sandino would not surrender his arms and would restart the war makes Sandino a clear threat to men like Ibarra and Somoza. The author also believes that President Sacasa was, at least, tolerating Sandino's designs or, at most, supporting them. Given this view, Ibarra concludes that Sandino was a clear threat to

Nicaragua's stability, as well as to Somoza's authority, and thus gave Somoza no choice but to eliminate the threat. Ibarra then goes on to strongly criticize the way in which Sandino was eliminated and, ultimately, he leaves the Guard and Nicaragua due to his strong opposition to Somoza.

Meanwhile, Somoza has announced his presidential candidacy in 1935 and surrounds the presidential palace with Guardia in 1936 forcing the resignation of President Sacasa. Somoza then convinces the Nicaraguan Congress to appoint his choice as interim president until Somoza wins the presidential election and takes office in January 1937. During the election campaign, Somoza casts himself as the one who brought peace and order to Nicaragua. He promises land reform in favor of the peasants, programs for workers, and more schools, among other promises. Somoza also criticizes the traditional parties and promises a new type of government with a new type of leader (Walter, 1993). It is during this period that he releases El verdadero Sandino, which is his construction of the Sandinista struggle. Even so, the Sandinista movement sporadically attempts a comeback though it was largely dormant during and after this period.

Hence, Sandino's struggle did not entirely end with his death in 1934. His general, Pedro Altamirano, began the struggle anew a year after Sandino's murder. Altamirano's activities had been more of a nuisance than a real threat until he increased those activities in 1937. The Guardia was occupied with "exterminating the remnants of Sandinismo" while the Sandinistas, without Sandino's political and military leadership, were becoming more isolated, poorly equipped and their living conditions more precarious (Blandón, 1981: 10). But by 1937, Altamirano's forces were threatening to

capture towns such as Jinotega, and the Guardia was unable to defeat them in open combat. Apparently, the Guardia recruited three former Sandinistas and some prostitutes to infiltrate the general's camp. Altamirano was normally surrounded by numerous trusted family members, but one of the prostitutes persuaded the general to spend the night with them, according to one account. Another simply says that a traitorous Sandinista slept near him. All accounts agree that he was then murdered in his sleep by the three Guardia agents, who also decapitated him and brought his head back to Managua (Millet, 1966; Blandón, 1981; Clark, 1992). A National Guardsman says that Altamirano's skull was sent as a present to US President Franklin Roosevelt (Ibarra, 1973). Altamirano's forces dissolved and thus was Sandino's movement silenced for several years.

In 1938 a very brief publication of "Biographical Facts" about President Somoza appeared (Aquino, 1938). After Sandino's death, not only was there a general, forceful effort to present Sandino as a villain but also to present Somoza as a good and heroic man of the people. In some ways, it might be said that Somoza was working to become what Sandino had been to many people. Toward these ends, the biographer begins with facts about Somoza's birth and the beginnings of his career. Then he observes that as the last US Marine transport left in 1933, the nation "was surprised in the face of a success that would have had very grave consequences without the opportunistic and energetic intervention of General Somoza" (Aquino, 1938: 6). The author further says that Nicaragua was on the verge of chaos when President Sacasa's presidency was threatened by some young army officers and that Somoza talked them out of their thoughts of insubordination. Apparently, Somoza explained to them that disrupting the peace of the

nation would not only bring dishonor to the army but would also show that Nicaraguans were not capable of governing themselves thus bringing a new armed intervention by the United States (Aquino, 1938: 7).

Of Sandino, Aquino (1938: 8) calls his activities "banditry" and a "cancerous tumor" that threatened the life of Nicaragua. Further, he says that President Sacasa was trying to reach an agreement with Sandino but marginalized Somoza and the Guard in the effort. Nevertheless, Somoza and the Guard cooperated with the President, but this cooperation was interpreted by Sandino as weakness, and he plotted against the Guard as evidenced by Somoza in The True Sandino. Then "at this truly burning point in the nation's life, General Somoza appears as the legitimate Peacemaker of Nicaragua..." (Aquino, 1938: 9). Aquino (1938: 9) continues that thus ends "this short epilogue of blood; and we say epilogue because with the death of Sandino thus ended once and for all the bloody chapter that would have been presented to the world..." There is no explanation of how Somoza achieved this peace or elimination of Sandino's threat and no explanation of how Sandino died.

The brief biography of Somoza goes on to laud his work to develop Nicaragua and to list his awards. Most importantly, it states that President Somoza has the "[support of] the majority of the Nicaraguan people and the approval of both political parties who wish for peace and order toward the achievement of national well-being" (Aquino, 1938: 10). The author (1938: 11) ends by saying that Somoza's development efforts have been accomplished "at great risk" and are distinguished as a "work of reconstruction" by General Somoza.

In 1940 the Somoza regime sentences several young people to prison or hard labor for reproducing and distributing the famous photograph of Somoza embracing Sandino and accusing Somoza of Sandino's murder (Walter, 1993). Luis Cardenal (1961) says that there was no revolutionary activity between 1944 and 1948 because the government had very effectively shut down all opposition. Then another of Sandino's generals, Juan Gregorio Colindres, attempts to restart the struggle against Somoza and the Guardia Nacional in 1948. Colindres' rebellion even has Conservative support, but it is quelled when the Guardia killed Colindres that same year. There is an armed revolt against the regime in 1954 led by Conservatives and former Guardia members. The revolt fails, and government repression is swift and vicious (Millett, 1966; Walter, 1993).

The rule of Anastasio Somoza García came to an abrupt end with his assassination by Rigoberto López Pérez in 1956. It seems that the assassination was the aim of a very small conspiracy organized outside the traditional opposition party structure. López was a student who had decided to kill Somoza knowing that he himself would be killed in the effort. Nevertheless, the government was in no danger of falling as Somoza's son, Luis, immediately steps to the presidency and largely continues his father's policies while Anastasio Jr. (Tachito) becomes director of the Guardia (Walter, 1993).

Somoza's presentation of Sandino as villain, bandit and disrupter of Nicaragua's peace and tranquillity is continued in backhanded fashion through the funeral speeches given in Somoza's honor. The eulogies, of course, make no mention of Sandino and credit Somoza with saving the country from foreign interests and bringing hard-won peace. Dr. Manuel F. Zurita, Deputy to the National Congress offers this praise:

> [Somoza] turned the noise of war into the noise of peace...He transformed misery into bread, and sickness into health and ignorance into light. He rescued the national wealth from foreign hands..." (Discursos Oficiales Pronunciados...1956).

Similarly, priest Don Luis Enrique Mehía y Fajardo lauded Somoza by saying, "We are before the body of the peacemaker of las Segovias..." (Discursos Oficiales Pronunciados...1956).

The murder of their father brings repression by the sons, Luis and Anastasio Jr. Thousands of members of the opposition are jailed and interrogated. Conservative journalist and *La Prensa* editor Pedro Joaquín Chamorro is among those arrested and jailed as he had been for the 1954 coup attempt. University students and future FSLN founders Carlos Fonseca and Tomás Borge are also jailed as conspirators. Borge spends two and one-half years in jail and then is released to house arrest but escapes to Honduras. Chamorro is also arrested just hours after the shooting. He spends the next forty months as a prisoner and victim of torture until his escape to Costa Rica with his wife Violeta.

Chamorro's book, Estirpe Sangrienta (Bloody Lineage), written during his captivity and published in 1959, provides a non-Sandinista, non-Somocista view of the dictator and of Sandino. In the book's preface, Sandino sympathizer Gregorio Selser writes of Chamorro (1959: viii.),

> In spite of being a Conservative and a Catholic, as simply a Nicaraguan who loves his country, Chamorro recognizes that the general Augusto César Sandino was not the bandit that the Yankees and Somocistas say he was, but a patriot that loved Nicaragua and fought for her with arms in hand until he was defeated by betrayal and iniquity.

Chamorro (1959: 45) writes that "Somoza had made all of Nicaragua his own great feudal estate" and that Somoza began his long career in 1934 "when he ordered the killing of Sandino."

In exposing the cruelty and corruption of the Somoza regime, Chamorro also recognizes the posthumous popularity and charisma of Sandino. First, he writes of the suspension of human rights during Somoza's time in power, illegal imprisonments, torture by the Guardia and Somoza's corruption and domination of the economy. Additionally, he writes of Somoza's efforts at contrived charisma as he tells of ports, towns and streets named after Somoza or his family members. He also mentions the presence of portraits and statues of Somoza throughout Nicaragua and the ever-present slogan, "Nicaragua marches with Somoza in the lead" (Chamorro, 1959: 45). Then, Chamorro's description of being transported to the Military Court after the assassination speaks to Sandino's continued hold on the people over twenty years after his death and in spite of Somoza's efforts to erase Sandino from the collective memory. He relates that while being transported, "the van went down a street that Somoza when alive, baptized with the name Roosevelt and that the people called Sandino..." (Chamorro, 1959: 161).

In 1958 one of Sandino's lieutenants, Ramón Raudales (then sixty-two years old) and others, launch a new revolution from Honduras. Inspired by Castro's efforts in Cuba, Raudales leads forty armed men into Nueva Segovia. The plan was to take a Guardia post in the small town of El Corozo. They fail to capture the garrison, and Tachito sends anti-guerrilla troops after the group, killing Raudales only a month after the old Sandinista had returned to Las Segovias. The small revolutionary force was completely defeated in 1961 (Blandón, 1981; Booth, 1985; Dierderich, 1989). In spite of the

immediate failure of Raudales, the new generation of revolutionaries, such as Fonseca and Borge, were inspired by Raudales' efforts and martyrdom at the hands of another Somoza (Diederich, 1989).

Again in 1959 Conservatives attempted a coup d'etat against the Somoza regime. Pedro Joaquín Chamorro was involved along with other elites such as Luis Cardenal. This time the attack was launched from Costa Rica and involved 112 men, none of them founders of the future Sandinistas. The force was better organized than previous efforts, but Tachito, as director of the Guardia Nacional, was also well prepared and took advantage of the group's mistakes. The revolutionaries did not find support among average Nicaraguans, and soon surrendered.

Luis Cardenal's book, Mi Rebelión (My Rebellion) (1961), relates his view of the Somozas and of the attempts at their overthrow as well as his involvement in those attempts. As one who knew the family well, Cardenal stated:

> Tacho has a deformed conscience...It's not that he cannot distinguish good from bad; he had a good education, and he understands perfectly. What happens is that he tries to convince himself and those around him that what is convenient for him, even though it is bad, is the best (Cardenal, 1969: 44).

Of Anastasio Jr., Cardenal (1961) wrote that he believed that Tachito was mentally disturbed but that he generally liked Cardenal.

Cardenal's analysis (1961) of the various efforts to remove the Somozas from power, including the 1959 attempt, is in terms of success and failure. He cites the organization of the efforts of the late fifties as a success but the political and military aspects as failures. He recognizes that while the people suffer, they are tired of being exploited and betrayed by the political parties and so do not respond to any calls from

any parties. Hence, the 1959 coup attempt did not attract popular support. He is also aware that groups such as the Frente Cívica and the Frente Interno lacked proper organization and relied on elites without organizing the people.

Periodically, there were other armed attacks on the regime or the National Guard, but the Somozas were always able to quell them. By 1960 any hemispheric attention given to the plight of average Nicaraguans under the Somoza dictatorship was shifted to the Cuban revolution and Castro. Meanwhile, Tachito spent many hours garnering and maintaining the support of his own men through training, salaries and material compensation, and a policy of receiving any Guardsman to hear suggestions and complaints (Diederich, 1989).

As one reads of the various attempts to rid Nicaragua of the Somoza dictatorship, whether from the observer's or the participant's perspective, the focus is very much situated in the present. The argument is always that the Somozas must go because they are cruel, repressive and too powerful. References to the past concentrate on cruelties of the Somozas. The issue for writers like Cardenal and Chamorro seems to be simple overthrow because the Somozas are bad. There is not much discussion of how to run the country differently nor much mention of the historical relationship between the United States and Nicaragua. The other part of their message seems to be that a Conservative coalition with a few Liberals conspired over several years to overthrow the Somoza dynasty and failed. There is no evidence that these elites tried to gain popular support for their efforts and extremely rare mention of Sandino. Contemporary Sandinista Blandón (1980) cites the cause of their failure as the tremendous gap between well-equipped urban Conservatives and ill-equipped peasants and workers who could have made the

difference. Certainly, these revolutionaries do not appear to view their efforts as any sort of continuation of Sandino's struggle. If they are part of a continuation of any other historic Nicaraguan struggle, they are part of one of those nagging forces that perpetually plague the nation as elites displace elites for control of the country. The 1959 coup attempt fits the historical pattern of Liberal/Conservative power struggles to dislodge one another from office. However, Cardenal and Chamorro do not view their role in this pattern as a problem; instead, it is the solution. They are very time-bound in their present of solving the single problem of Somoza rule, and there is no wholesale reconstruction of history.

Constructing Nicaragua's Official History

Obviously, Somoza García was able to construct an official national history because he had the power to do it. His takeover of the Nicaraguan government and control of the means of violence - the National Guard - gave him the ultimate bully pulpit for sending any message he wished. The question becomes how did the Somozas construct history and relay it and how did they frustrate the opposition and erase Sandino?

As mentioned in Chapter Two, access to and use of communications systems and technology are crucial to the social movement attempting to reconstruct history. In any society, there will be an official history, perhaps various versions of it, that is generally sanctioned by the dominant group. By definition, the dominant group has the power to maintain their versions of history as consensual and true. If movement participants construct a counterpast but are unable to get their message out, then the movement will be ineffective in terms of achieving a re-ordering of society.

For decades, the Somozas were able to maintain an official history that made Somoza a hero and disparaged Sandino but largely erased him. They further were able to eliminate or suppress attempts to remind the population of him and to silence the non-Sandinista opposition to their regime as the examples above demonstrate. The combination of putting forth an official history of Nicaragua and suppressing other versions of history is highly dependent on control and use of communications systems and education.

Communications and education are two obvious means for distributing official history. In each case, specific messages and facts are relayed to an audience. Control of which messages and facts are distributed and in which context certainly aids the construction of history. In Nicaragua, the Somozas enjoyed extensive control over the communications networks and media and certainly had almost exclusive control over the content and delivery of education.

As previously mentioned, Somoza published his story of Sandino's revolt within two years of Sandino's death. The book served to establish an official account of Nicaragua's most recent history and also served to begin to legitimate Somoza's rise to power. El verdadero Sandino focused on vilifying Sandino but allowed for Somoza to eventually be presented as a true patriot and peacemaker who stood in the way of Sandino's bloody rampage and his inevitable attempt to install himself as Nicaragua's caudillo. Such were the images of Somoza portrayed in public as exemplified in the biographical sketch and funeral speech cited previously.

Communications in Somoza's Nicaragua

In spite of the powerful message of Somoza's book, most of Somoza's power to control the construction of history lay in his control of mass media. Central American rulers have been notorious for media control and censorship, and the Somozas were no different. Nichols (1982: 182) notes that much of the Latin American media "were founded and continue to serve as collaborators with specialized power contenders in society, usually political factions" or operate in a "tradition...of political advocacy" (Rudolph, 1982: 157). In other words, the party or persons in power will favor and will be favored by the media that support them. Likewise, opposition media will suffer negative consequences such as censorship, harassment, closure, or worse.

An important aspect of Somoza's ability to construct Nicaragua's history was the enormously high rate of illiteracy in the country. Official estimates are that between 50% and 60% were illiterate, and unofficial estimates place the number at between 60% - 70% of the population. Therefore, the Area Handbook for Nicaragua (Ryan, et al, 1970: 189) observes that Nicaragua has more of a "class media" than a mass media since it is largely the upper classes that are consuming information from newspapers and Somoza's book. This phenomenon cuts both ways; the majority of the Nicaraguan population does not read of Somoza's abuses or of Sandino, but neither do they read Somoza's view of the world.

Probably due to the high illiteracy rate, there was a small circulation of daily newspapers throughout the Somoza period. In fact, in 1964 the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) reported that the distribution of newspapers was 6.6 copies per 100 Nicaraguans compared to 32.6 papers

per 100 in the United States and 9.4 per 100 Costa Ricans. All of the dailies were privately owned, and most were sold on the streets of Managua. Those sold outside of Managua were by subscription (UNESCO, 1966). The number of dailies grew from 1937 to 1950 and then declined (Lapple-Wagenhals, 1984). Nicaragua had no news agency of its own and, therefore, relied on the Associated Press and United Press International from the US for international news and on local newspaper reporters as well as press departments of government agencies for domestic news (UNESCO, 1966).

As noted above, Latin American newspapers were generally allied with a particular political interest. In 1970 there were six dailies in Nicaragua. (Merrill, et al, 1970). Three of them were owned by the Somozas, and two were controlled by the family. Only La Prensa, owned by the Conservative Chamorro family, was the exception.

Nicaragua's first newspaper of significant duration was founded in 1835 by President José Zepeda and used as a political tool (Ryan, et al, 1970). Other papers followed. Somoza's Partido Liberal de Nicaragua (PLN) established La Hora in the 1930s followed in 1936 by Novedades, a daily owned by the Somoza family. Somoza began Novedades to counter La Prensa's opposition (Diederich, 1989).

In the tradition of collaborative journalism, La Prensa was a major player in Nicaragua favoring the Conservative party against Somoza and the PLN. Its editor, Pedro Joaquín Chamorro Cardenal, descended from a long line of Conservative party faithfuls that included four Nicaraguan presidents. His father, Pedro Joaquín Chamorro Zelaya, bought La Prensa in 1930, and the son became publisher in 1952. La Prensa was relentless in printing editorials opposing the Somoza regime and articles that exposed

government corruption. That is, the paper published such things when it was not censored.

Censorship was routinely used by the Somozas in their effort to suppress presentations of Nicaragua's past and present contrary to their own and to put forth their construction of history. During Tacho's regime, the press was under strict censorship. He created laws that restricted the type of information that could be printed prohibiting anything that might disrupt public order or criticize the principal institutions of government, especially the Guardia Nacional (Walter, 1993; Diederich, 1989). At times, newspaper offices were closed by the government and/or newspaper employees arrested. In fact, the manual used by US military personnel to familiarize themselves with Nicaragua says that "the opposition press was effectively silenced during the governments of the elder Somoza" (Ryan, et al, 1970: 189). Newspapers were not even allowed to state that they were being censored. Therefore, La Prensa developed a creative way to let its readership know when it was being censored. Editors replaced censored articles with photos of Ava Gardner, and readers recognized their meaning (Nichols, 1982).

As mentioned previously, the younger Chamorro was arrested numerous times for participating in anti-government activities. Other journalists were arrested at various times and accused of crimes against the state including attempting to assassinate the president. For example, members of the Robleto family, executives of the opposition paper La Flecha, were also arrested and tortured by the National Guard (Nichols, 1982). However, it was Chamorro and La Prensa that consistently persisted in efforts to criticize and expose Somoza despite the relentless pressure from the regime. In fact, La Prensa's

opposition was often useful to the government as Somoza could cite its operation as proof of press freedom (Nichols, 1982). It worked. Merrill, Bryan and Alisky (1970: 190) note that "the Inter-American Press annually cites this republic as having press freedom..." They (Merrill, et al, 1970: 190) also observe that it "is true technically in that no censors remain on duty at the newspapers" but that the censors are also unnecessary as most editors support the Somoza regime.

After Tacho's assassination, Luis Somoza relaxed censorship somewhat. One example of this reduction of pressure on the press was the government's consent to the opening of a school of journalism affiliated with the National University of Nicaragua and funded by the Fulbright Commission. US college professor and former news correspondent Marvin Alisky was founding director of the school that opened in 1960. Three La Prensa editors became faculty and taught investigative journalism among other topics. However, as newly graduated reporters went to work, the University, under pressure from the Minister of Education, ended the school's affiliation. However, the Jesuit university welcomed the school into its program (Alisky, 1981).

Both Luis and Tachito relied less on overt, formal censorship than had their father. Instead, the younger Somozas made it very difficult for the opposition to publish by restricting access to necessary materials like newsprint, machinery and spare parts, as well as restricting access to official news sources (Nichols, 1982; Lapple-Wagenhals, 1984). Of the opposition press, only La Prensa remained fully functional, and it remained so in spite of the additional annoyance of legal harassment from Tachito (Nichols, 1982).

Chamorro's continued opposition and Somoza's continuing harassment of La Prensa (and Chamorro) brought Chamorro to the international attention of news organizations and human rights groups. Chamorro won international awards for his leadership in press freedom thus providing him with outside support to further criticize the Somoza regime. In the early seventies, coverage of government corruption following the 1972 earthquake and Sandinista activities brought renewed censorship. Somoza's actions only intensified international criticism and pressure from groups such as Amnesty International and even US President Jimmy Carter. Somoza responded by easing restrictions, and Chamorro unleashed some of his most vicious critiques (Alisky, 1981; Nichols, 1982; Diederich, 1989). Therefore, Chamorro's assassination in 1978 was assumed everywhere to be the work of Somoza and ignited the final insurrection.

Radio was even more severely censored than the print media. It was first introduced to the country by US companies beginning in 1921 with Tropical Radio Telegraph Company owned by United Fruit. However, it was not a broadcasting endeavor. The company's services were routinely used by New York Times' reporters to send their stories of the Sandino rebellion back to New York. Similarly, *Radio Nacional* was introduced by the US Marines and the Guardia Nacional to connect guardposts in response to Sandino's attacks on telephone and telegraph lines (Lapple-Wagenhals, 1984). The first real radio broadcasting began in 1934.

The government dominated radio from the 1940s until 1979. *Radio Nacional* and *Radio Equis* were all owned by the Somoza government or the Somoza family. Of the eighty-two licensed radio stations operating in 1969, forty-seven of them were part of the *Radio Nacional* system (Ryan, et al, 1970). *Radio Católica* (owned by the Catholic

Church), *Radio Deportes* and *Radio Mundial* (both privately owned) were other important stations operating in the 1960s and 1970s (Lapple-Wagenhals, 1984).

Control of radio broadcasting through ownership, management and licensing certainly afforded the Somozas the opportunity to put forth their construction of Nicaraguan reality. Again, illiteracy was extremely high in the country so the population depended on radio for news. Each household was likely to have a cheap transistor radio, and Ryan, et al (1970: 191) observes that "radio reache[d] more people in Nicaragua than any other medium, except, without doubt, word of mouth." In fact, nine of ten households got their news from radio (Merrill, et al, 1970). Therefore, it was extremely important to control radio and what the government could not control directly, it controlled through censorship. Government censors were stationed at *Radio Mundial* and *Radio Noticias* after each consistently broadcast stories critical of the government. Since *Radio Mundial* held the largest news audience in the nation, government censorship of this privately owned station was crucial for Somoza. After 1962, all independent news stations were subject to censorship (Alisky, 1981). Meanwhile, Somoza's stations provided upbeat and uncritical news and programming such as *Radio Nacional* broadcasting agricultural news (Alisky, 1982).

Control of the television industry was similar to that of radio. The first television station began operation in 1955 as a commercial enterprise by the Somoza family. This television station was the only one for several years and was housed in the same building with Somoza's *Radio Equis* and his newspaper, Novedades (Merrill, et al, 1964). By mid 1967, two stations were owned by the Somozas, and three were owned by others.

Apparently, the Sacasas were the only family that gave the Somozas any serious competition in this arena (Lapple-Wagenhals, 1984).

Television was unlikely to be a news source for the vast majority of Nicaraguans because most could not afford to buy one. In addition, access to electricity was limited (Lapple-Wagenhals, 1984). However, this upper class phenomenon was still an important avenue for the government to relay its presentation of the nation. Not surprisingly, broadcast news was heavily censored by the government (Nichols, 1982; Merrill, et al, 1970). Yet most programming was entertainment anyway with only two percent of it being news, and stations were on the air for only five to eight hours per day during the Somoza period (UNESCO, 1966).

The most common form of communication was word of mouth. Postal, telegraph and telephone were all operated by the National Guard and had no private competition. Usage of these services was low anyway due to illiteracy, lack of affordability, and poor availability. On the other hand, word of mouth was widespread due to communication between extended family members across the country. In addition, public gatherings such as community festivals brought people together to hear speeches as well as celebrating (Ryan, et al, 1970).

Education in Somoza's Nicaragua

Education has always been valued in Nicaragua, but it has been viewed and administered in light of its Spanish and religious roots as a phenomenon of the upper classes. In the 1940s, the government became more directly involved in education. The 1950 Nicaraguan Constitution declared that education was a primary responsibility of the government, and even private schools were under the jurisdiction of the State (Ryan, et

al, 1970). Nevertheless, illiteracy rates during the Somoza period ranged from between 50% and 70% as stated previously.

Middle- and upper-class children had the means to enter and continue in school through the secondary level and even to college in many cases. However, for most rural and lower class children, social tradition and their economic situation meant that they would only complete one or two years of school. Even though school was technically free to citizens, related costs and foregoing income from a child's labor caused many families to withdraw children after only a year or two. In fact, "in 1964 only 7.2 percent of registered first grade students completed the six years of primary school" (Ryan, et al, 1970: 115). After 1950 literacy did increase, as did secondary enrollment, but overall literacy rates and secondary enrollment remained low (Ryan, 1970).

The Nicaraguan Ministry of Education controlled virtually every aspect of education, public and private. It created the curricula, supervised examinations, appointed teachers and specified the design of facilities among other things (Ryan, et al, 1970). Neither teachers nor school administers were allowed to make changes to the nationwide, standardized curricula and testing. While private schools had control over their own finances and policies, even they were under the supervision of the government. This centralized control of education accounted, to some degree, for the concentration of schools and students in the urban areas, especially in Managua (Ryan, et al, 1970; Kraft, 1983).

An example of the Somoza government's control of curriculum and, therefore, official history, is a 1946 teacher's guide published by the Ministry of Public Education. The guide is fairly detailed in its coverage of language, arithmetic, hygiene, home

economics, agriculture, geography, history and something called social, civic and moral education. Of particular interest to this study is the presentation of Nicaragua's history. This section focuses on the culture of indigenous people before European contact, the arrival of Columbus and the Spanish conquest of Central America. Then there is quite a lengthy exposition of the "National War," which refers to the ousting of the filibuster William Walker who had imposed himself as President of Nicaragua. Sara Barquero, educator and author of the guide, names a small number of men who the teachers are to discuss with students. In the chapter about the National War, the book celebrates José Dolores Estrada as the model Nicaraguan hero for his role in turning back the filibusters on the field of battle and showing Nicaraguans that foreign invaders are not invincible. The last chapter, called "Principal Governors and Notable Men in Nicaragua," identifies only eleven such men. Most were past presidents of Nicaragua. Of particular interest given Somoza's press censorship, is the appearance on the list of Don Fernando Guzman who "gave freedom to the press, that consists of allowing journalists to freely express ideas" (Barquero, 1946: 235).

Of course, Sandino's name does not appear, but Somoza García receives high praise and more than half a page of attention though the others merit only a few lines. The first sentence immediately legitimizes Somoza by saying that he became president by popular vote. Further, he is consistently called "General Somoza" by Barquero and is appreciated throughout the piece for his progressive policies and accomplishments while president. The last sentence declares, "General A. Somoza is considered the most progressive governor that Nicaragua has had" (Barquero, 1946: 237).

A second example of the regime's efforts to control curriculum is the 1952 Plan of Study and Program for the Rural Schools of Nicaragua produced under the supervision of Crisanto Sacasa. The plan outlines material to be covered in the classroom including the subjects of language, math, social science, natural science, health, and home and community education. The plan is part of the government's national literacy campaign and, interestingly, only covers first and second grade.

Some mandates of the 1952 plan are general. For example, it states that "this program should not be interpreted in a rigid sense and should take advantage of the interest and understanding of the children…" (Ministerio de Educación Pública, 1952: 21). On the other hand, it dictates that "the only official text for teaching reading is the National Literacy Campaign booklet" (Ministerio de Educación Pública, 1952: 23), and it also mandates a schedule, with specific times and subjects delineated for each weekday.

In 1967 the Somoza government enacted numerous reforms such as increasing educational funding and standardizing the school-year calendar. Nevertheless, control of each aspect of education was still controlled by the regime. For example, Somoza himself made numerous corrections and suggestions in red pencil when reviewing the new curriculum that was part of the reform process (Kraft, 1983).

The government launched a National Plan for Education in 1971, which included a study of the reasons for the extremely high dropout rate. Kraft (1983: 90) found that the major reason for the phenomenon throughout the country was "the fact that schools in many rural areas ended at the third grade so that students had no further school to attend." In spite of funding increases and US aid for education, materials were lacking and teachers were poorly trained.

Corruption and inefficiency severely hindered education and contributed to the dropout rate (Kraft, 1983). Only a part of the problem was funding not getting to the proper people so that teachers could be adequately trained, equipment and textbooks provided and facilities built and maintained. In addition, the regime might reward some bureaucrats with non-existent teaching jobs, which allowed them to collect double salaries. Some supporters were rewarded with international scholarships, and teachers were fired for questioning the status quo (Nichols, 1982).

United States' influence on the Nicaraguan educational system was extensive. The US began technical assistance to education in 1950 including programs for vocational education and rural education. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) had great power over education planning in order to gear the Nicaraguan educational system toward meeting the labor needs of a country that even Somoza admitted was dependent on the US for markets and capital (Kraft, 1983).

Textbooks are critical to any educational system and, in addition to the teacher's communications with the students, serve to not only teach traditional school subjects but to present a specific view of the world or construct an official history. As Arnove (1980) notes about education, students learn not only what is taught but also learn attitudes, feelings and self-concepts. In Nicaragua's case, USAID recruited US educators to work with Nicaraguans to develop texts. Not surprisingly, much of the material in the texts was biased toward North American values but the texts were deemed to be adequate by many professionals (Arnove, 1986). Somoza also personally authorized the publication of Nicaraguan historical document collections and historical narratives. Thus,

Nicaraguans heard and learned largely what the government wanted them to hear and learn, but also learned how to think about and feel about Somoza's rule.

In 1954 the first volume of Documents on the History of Nicaragua from the "Somoza Collection" was published. Most of the documents were selected from Spanish archives and some from the Nicaraguan national archives. The collection begins with a letter from Christopher Columbus to the King and Queen of Spain and ends with documents about the independence of Central America in 1852. As stated earlier, Somoza García himself authorized the collection and publication of these documents as well as all the funding needed for the project. He also names Andrés Vega, Nicaragua's ambassador to Spain, as manager of the project.

Vega explains very generally the method of document selection. "We omit that which falls into the area of interpretation or judgment..." presenting only the documents for others to interpret and study (Vega, 1954: ix). He, of course, does not consider that such a selection process involves interpretation and judgment. Vega also provides a copy of Somoza's authorization of the collection, which includes his and/or Somoza's view on the role of history in the present:

> Considering that the national history should be the motivation of constant study and investigation, since through knowing the past one acquires a better awareness of the people's present...a knowledge wider than its idiosyncrasies and an orientation more defined for the future of the nation and the progressive development of its material and spiritual possibilities (Vega, 1954: xi).

In 1955 the reprinting of two narrative histories were approved as part of the "Somoza Collection." One was entitled History of Nicaragua and was a reprinting of a book by Tomás Ayón first published in 1882 and authorized by then President of

Nicaragua, Joaquín Zavala. The act signed by Somoza authorizing its reprinting states that it is the duty of the State to preserve and make available material that contribute to the "true history of Nicaragua," which this narrative apparently did in Somoza's mind. Interestingly, the act noted that the book has "some historical errors and deficiencies" but that "it will contribute to the strengthening" of Nicaraguan patrotism (Ayón, 1956: 7).

Ayón outlined his methodological concerns in 1882 about writing Nicaragua's history. "To write the history of a people is to uncover from within the darkness of the past the entirety of its ideas, aspirations, virtues and vices," he writes as he assumes that the past can be discovered in its entirety (1956: 10). Ayón also struggles with the lack of data available as he admits that there are few archives, and most of his information is from general works about American Indians and Spanish exploration and conquest. Perhaps most interesting to this present study is Ayón's (1956: 11) discussion of the politics of history:

> Another of the dangers to which the one who writes about history is exposed is that of attracting to oneself the anger of those who have not examined enough of the resources in order to confirm an act or establish an opinion; they are scandalized when a thing is said that does not conform to their wishes or that collides suddenly with national pride.

In each of the aforementioned works in the "Somoza Collection," a major focus is the initial Spanish conquest of Nicaragua by Captain Gil González Dávila. The documents and narrative tell of the conquest from Gil González' perspective, which includes a positive view of Nicaragua or Nicarao, the Indian chief who submitted to the Spanish without a fight as well as agreeing to baptism for himself and his thousands of followers. Uncooperative chiefs like Diriangén and Tenderi are cast negatively.

The second narrative history approved in 1955 was Historia de Nicaragua by José D. Gámez. This book attempts to treat the indigenous people of Nicaragua before European contact. Gámez admits the difficulty of collecting data about that period saying that he must rely on the "imperfect traditions of the aborigines" and Spanish records. He notes that the Spaniards were interested in justifying the conquest in their writings and thus included some "absurd fables" (Gámez, 1889: 18).

Gámez' account of Gil Gonzalez' activities is still from the Spanish perspective but seems a bit more detached than does Ayón's work. The narrative concludes with 1860 after spending six chapters telling the story of North American filibusterer William Walker's failed attempts to conquer Nicaragua. Gámez ends by telling the story of Walker's execution after his capture and makes the US seem silly in its effort to distance itself from Walker's activities (Gámez, 1889).

Published in 1968, Apuntes de historia de Nicaragua (History Notes About Nicaragua) was a textbook approved by the Somoza regime that followed the lead of the history books above. In telling the story of Gil González, the text noted the power of Chief Nicaragua but that Gil González did not hesitate to confront him. Gil González sent envoys to him proposing peace if Nicaragua submitted to the Catholic faith and the King of Spain or war if he did not. Nicaragua accepted the Captain's proposal and "received the Conquistador with a lot of pomp and solemnity" (Quintana, 1968: 25). On the other hand, Diriangén, the chief who called Nicaragua a traitor to his people because of his submission to the Spaniards and who raised an army against Gil González, is called "savage" and "impetuous" (Quintana, 1968: 28).

This same text covers modern Nicaraguan history and mentions Sandino as well as Somoza's ascent to power. Of course, Sandino is characterized as a troublemaker, and Somoza García is presented as the man who saved the nation. The text says that Sandino arrived in Nicaragua on a boat sent by the Mexican government to help General Moncada in the Revolution of 1926. He had left his home country of Nicaragua because, as a young man, he had to "abandon Nicaragua since he was mixed up in the death of an individual" (Quintana, 1968: 191). In three years he worked three jobs in three different countries. In Mexico, Sandino "became completely conversant in nationalistic and revolutionary ideas" as he watched the struggles between the Mexican people and the US oil companies (Quintana, 1968: 191). Then Sandino arrived in Nicaragua to fight in the Revolution but refused to lay down his arms after the peace treaty of Tipitapa is signed by Moncada. Thus he began "the guerrilla war that would assault the country for seven long years" (Quintana, 1968:192).

Sandino's war is summarized in a paragraph entitled "The Pain of Las Segovias." Interestingly, the text blames both the Sandinistas and the US marines for the suffering. "The unhappy inhabitants of Las Segovias suffered a double martyrdom: on the one hand the Sandinista hordes, headed by Pedrón Altamirano, - brutal and merciless - and on the other hand the excesses of the Yankee Marines," according to the text (Quintana, 1968:192). Also interesting is that the paragraph seems to place more blame for the carnage on Sandino's subordinates than on him.

The text goes on to relate the peace negotiations between Sandino and the government, but in the next paragraph says that when "terrorists set fire to the war arsenal that was stored in Campo de Marte [National Guard headquarters] it was the beginning of

what was about to happen" (Quintana, 1968: 194). After dinner with President Sacasa at the Presidential Palace, Sandino and his generals Estrada and Umanzor are detained by the Guard and shot. The section entitled "Death of Sandino" admits that Sandino's story lives on (Quintana, 1968: 194):

> With the death of Sandino, another bloody chapter of the History of Nicaragua is closed. The figure of Sandino is blown out of proportion with the embellishments of Legend; and the myth extends its wings, over the profile of the warrior, but the Segovian mountains, scene living in pain; still they tremble in anguish, before the memory of what they have lived.

Meanwhile, the introduction of Somoza García in the midst of Sandino's story is entitled "Somoza in the Panorama of History." He is introduced as President Sacasa's choice to head the newly created National Guard. After Sandino's death, Somoza requests Sacasa's resignation and wins the presidential election that follows. "With Somoza an era of peace and progress is begun in Nicaragua, the Country, was guided on the paths of order and work," states the text (Quintana, 1968: 195). The section goes on to praise Somoza's social and economic achievements as historic progress. It even admits that Somoza has "achieved works of undeniable progress, through continuous Constitutional reform, perpetuating himself in Power...for the prosperity of democratic Nations" (Quintana, 1968: 195).

Interestingly, the story of the Liberal revolt of 1926 told by Somoza in speeches and in textbooks had become, with time, a revolt that was less about ousting the Conservatives and more about ousting the Yankees. In 1926 the Liberals were not talking about the Yankees as an insult to their sovereignty. Only Sandino was using that type of rhetoric. When the "Somoza Collection" was published, Dr. Crisanto Sacasa was

the Minister of Education who, technically, oversaw the project. At Sacasa's funeral in 1964, Nicaraguan Luis Somoza Debayle told stories of Sacasa's bravery during the Liberal revolt of 1909. This bravery occurred in spite of the fact that "...foreign troops, from a country [the US] of incomparable power, intervened..." (Homenaje..., 1965: 15). Later, Sacasa distinguished himself again in 1926 when the US once again intervened and the majority of Nicaraguans defended their rights. Crisanto Sacasa represented the Liberal party as its peace negotiator in the 1933 resolution of Sandino's struggle. A few years after that revolt, Somoza named Sacasa as Minister of Education (Homenaje..., 1965).

During Anastasio Somoza Debayle's rule, a new book was published that told, once again, the heroic story of his father. Somoza, el lider de Nicaragua (Suarez, 1971) provided a biographical sketch of Somoza García that was, at first, somewhat matter-of-fact and even a bit humble. It simply relates that he took part in the 1926 revolution against the Conservative government and then tells the positions he held including being named Chief Director of the National Guard. Sandino is not mentioned in this section.

In a section called "Somoza, Guarantee of Peace," Sandino is mentioned, swept aside, and Somoza is praised. According to the book, Sandino and his followers were bringing great suffering to Nicaragua, and it was Somoza who provided the leadership necessary and brought peace to the troubled Segovias region. "Until that moment he [Somoza] had no ambition to govern the destiny of the homeland. It was in Granada where celebrating the advent of peace and the end of banditry that he proclaimed his presidential candidacy..." (Suárez, 1971: 22). The author then calls Somoza a man of peace and claims that Sandino and those like him destroy time itself.

> Somoza loves peace...he was a witness to the hellish horrors of the Segovian tragedy, that the evils of civil war are incalcuable and that they not only fall over the generations that blindly promote them, but also over those that come later, destroying the present, erasing the past and frustrating the hopes of tomorrow" (Suárez, 1971, 23).

Then finally, it is Somoza who is the man of history. "No one but he [Somoza] in the past or present has served the citizens so gallantly, efficiently, and transcendentally," concludes the author (Suárez, 1971: 27). It is during this same time that there is a re-issue of Somoza García's book, El verdadero Sandino.

A largely uneducated and uninformed citizenry fit well with the Somoza model of governance. As Miller notes, "The dictatorship's economic model depended upon large numbers of unskilled, docile farm workers...Education for these groups was neither required nor encouraged..." since widespread participation in decision-making was not at all what the Somozas wanted (Miller, 1982: 246). Neither did this group read of or hear dissent from media such as La Prensa due to the elite nature of media as well as Somoza's control of it.

The following year, 1972, brings the devastating Managua earthquake. As outlined in a previous chapter, the inefficiency and corruption of the Guard in the handling of international aid to earthquake victims was obvious not only to Nicaraguans but to the global community as well. The Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) had been formed in 1961 and was menacing the Guard. In 1973 a former National Guardsman published The Last Night of General Augusto C. Sandino and told about the abduction and murder of Sandino and implicated Somoza as giving the final approval for the murders. The FSLN captured the National Palace in 1974, and the Sandinistas were victorious in 1979.

Somoza's construction of an official history for Nicaragua appears to have been rather successful for many years. Yet, somehow the contemporary Sandinistas managed to reconstruct the nation's history and successfully disseminate that reconstruction in spite of Somoza's control of policy, communications, education and the means of violence. The story of Sandino, while becoming a whisper during the Somoza period, was told and heard by someone able to use that story to bring about the downfall of one of the most enduring dynasties in Latin America.

Somoza on Sandino

El verdadero Sandino provides a clear picture of Somoza's official reconstruction of Sandino, and it overlaps heavily with the North American presentation. As outlined in Chapter Six, in Somoza's official Nicaragua, Sandino had a violent character and is bloodthirsty, was capricious in his use of violence, was insensitive to suffering and was a murderer of the defenseless. He was also vain, a publicity monger, and selfish. Sandino did not trust his own men, was stubborn and lied. Somoza also charges that Sandino was amoral, that he was a traitor and that his fight against the United States was foolish and illegitimate. In Somoza's official history, Sandino was not even misguided; he was recklessly putting his own interests first at the expense of human lives and peace. The author of the book's prologue adds that Sandino suffered from a mental disorder and is a megalomaniac who imagined himself as the only political and military authority in the nation.

At least one Guardsman, Ibarra, presents Sandino as a patriot, however misguided, and as a man disinterested in personal gain. However, Sandino was not very intelligent and was a clear threat to the government so he had to be eliminated. Ibarra

agrees with Somoza that President Sacasa was probably supporting Sandino at the expense of the National Guard.

The official presentation of Somoza, on the other hand, is that he saved the nation when the Marines left. Nicaragua was going to drift into chaos again, and Sandino was the likely cause. Therefore, Somoza was a peacemaker and reconstructed Nicaragua, making it a nation of peace and progress, order and work. His outstanding leadership had the support of the majority of Nicaraguans, and he was the most progressive governor that Nicaragua had ever had.

The Nicaraguan press had difficulty presenting an image of Somoza alternative to the one described above due to censorship or direct control of it by the Somozas. Meanwhile, Nicaraguan history books supported the official history. So Somoza was a good president, even a hero. Sandino was generally absent in history or mentioned in order to make a point praising Somoza. However, one book recognizes that his legend continues to some degree but also says that Sandino is blown out of proportion. Those same histories speak in very positive ways of Spanish conquistador Gil González Dávila and chief Nicaragua who welcomed the Spanish and allowed himself to be baptized. Chief Diriangén, who resisted the Spanish, was a savage. Likewise, they speak well of General Moncada, who signed the Tipitapa agreement with the US, and ignore or criticize Sandino.

The military activities of the United States in Nicaragua are generally ignored in Somoza's official history. At times, there is mild criticism, but a great amount of criticism is heaped upon the filibusterer William Walker who imposed himself as Nicaragua's president in the 1850s. Walker is presented as a clear example of US

interference, but other examples are scarce. However, there is some mention of the marines excesses in fighting the war, but their presence in Nicaragua is not necessarily questioned.

When Carlos Fonseca, Tomás Borge, and Silvio Mayorga are growing up in Nicaragua, the preceding history is what they know of Nicaragua, of Somoza, and of Sandino. They will hear some whispers about Sandino and will learn of Marxism. They will also determine that the traditional Nicaraguan political system, in which Somoza and Chamorro have been key players, perpetuates the domination of Nicaragua by local elites and the United States.

Somoza's Construction of History and Sandino's Charisma

Not surprisingly, this chapter is the shortest of the four chapters that relate historical constructions of Nicaragua and Sandino. It is relatively short because the Somozas briefly demonized Sandino and then rarely spoke of him again. Obviously, as the rulers of Nicaragua, they had the power to impose their construction of history as the official one.

Somoza García had to explain the emergent event of his own rise to power and did so by disparaging Sandino, making himself a heroic patriot and withholding criticism of the United States. According to the Somocist construction of history, the United States had generally been friend to Nicaragua although had, at time, overstepped the bounds of friendship. Filibusterer William Walker was the prime example of overstepping, but the US marine occupation beginning in 1925 was another. Nicaraguans, such as Chief Nicarao and General Moncada, who made peace agreements with dominant powers like the US, were national heroes. Those who did not and resisted,

like Chief Diriangén and Sandino, were reckless and dangerous. In fact, Sandino's struggle was characterized as a civil war that destroyed the present, erased the past and frustrated the future (Suárez, 1971).

Somoza certainly negated Sandino using a multitude of negative nouns and adjectives to describe him. On the other hand, there was fleeting recognition of Sandino's charisma among people who were neither followers or even sympathizers. Former National Guardsman Ibarra mentioned some of Sandino's charismatic qualities such as he sought no personal reward, was an unimpeachable patriot and challenged the colossus. Pedro Joaquín Chamorro noted the continued hold that Sandino had on people twenty-two years after his murder. Even Somoza (1979: 4, 549) admitted that Sandino was "a legendary figure" and that his followers considered him "an apostle." But, again, Sandino essentially disappeared from history in Somoza's Nicaragua.

In place of a charismatic Sandino, Somoza García was the compassionate leader of the Nicaraguan people. He was the one, not Sandino, who assured the permanent withdrawal of the marines and "rescued national wealth from foreign hands" (Discursos Oficiales Pronunciados...1956). He brought peace progress to the nation. He named streets and buildings after himself. Schools and media were filled with this image of Somoza.

Yet, even though Somoza was successful in acquiring and maintaining wide-ranging control of Nicaragua and significant loyalty from followers, his own "charisma" seemed manufactured. The repression and coercion were certainly not indicative of charisma in the Weberian sense. Alternatively, the loyalty of Sandino's followers to Sandino continued after his death. In spite of rather thorough historical elimination of

Sandino, Somoza was not thorough enough. There were enough living witnesses to Sandino's struggle and just enough written information available that some university students were able to learn of him and follow his example into a revolution that would succeed. These students clearly understood the official history of Nicaragua but did not believe or agree with it. They were able to discover enough evidence of a counterpast that they drive that successful revolution.

CHAPTER VII

EL FRENTE SANDINISTA DE LIBERACIÓN NACIONAL & THE COUNTERPAST

Carlos Fonseca Amador sat for an interview in the Hotel Capri in Havana, Cuba in November 1970. Fonseca (1981: 217) mentioned, almost as an aside, that in 1958, "for the first time in a long time the name of Augusto César Sandino sounds again in Nicaragua after a quarter century of darkness, of paralysis, of atrophy of the popular movement in Nicaragua." Later in the interview, the reporter asks what had happened to the memory of Sandino until 1958, Fonseca utters now famous words. "The name of Sandino was a whisper," he replied (Fonseca, 1981: 219).

According to Fonseca, Sandino's name had all but disappeared due to the use of terror, purposeful obscuring of knowledge, the power of reactionaries and the conservatism of Nicaragua intellectuals. The "official version about Sandino" was that he was "an outlaw," but Fonseca said that the Nicaraguan people "were not fooled" (Fonseca, 1981: 219). Fonseca himself first heard of Sandino when he was ten or twelve years old. He was even told that he had a distant relative who had fought with Sandino and who had been murdered along with several other rebels (Fonseca, 1981). However, it is not clear that Fonseca heard much more until a few years later.

Ultimately, it will be Fonseca who systematically recovers and distributes Sandino's thought and story. It will be Fonseca who insists that "Sandinista" be part of the name of the revolutionary force and who clarifies the links between Sandino's

struggle and the contemporary Sandinistas. Sandinista commander Jaime Wheelock Román (Fonseca, 1984b: ii) says:

> ...[Fonseca] was pursuing the recovery [of Sandino's thought] in the most precise political dimension, the epic, the thought and the historical magnitude of the General of Free Men, for so much time subjected to concealment, distortion, and enemy slander or to the folklore and caricature of hypocrites...Carlos assumed the role of conductor in the conscious responsibility of being the intermediary, bridge, interpreter for the new generations of the enlightening teachings of Sandino.

Carlos Fonseca Amador was born in 1936 in Matagalpa to unmarried parents. Like Sandino, his mother was a domestic, and his father was a man of some means. During his boyhood, he works at a number of jobs such as selling candies, selling newspapers, and delivering telegrams. Fonseca is also very studious and, with his secondary school friend Tomás Borge, reads numerous books including John Steinbeck's Grapes of Wrath. Borge and Fonseca also discover Marx and Engels' work. By 1952, Fonseca is already demonstrating opposition to Somoza and joins the National Union of Popular Action (UNAP). Meanwhile, he and his friends are reading literature from the Communist party and articles about the concerns of workers. In the summer of 1955, Fonseca joins the National Socialist Party (PSN) (Fonseca, 1981; Borge, nd).

Fonseca moves to León, works at La Prensa, enrolls in Law School and, with Silvio Mayorga and Tomás Borge, forms a group to advocate on behalf of workers' rights. Six days after Rigoberto López Pérez assassinates Somoza García in 1956, Fonseca and Borge are arrested and Fonseca remains in jail for almost two months, while Borge remains for several more months (Instituto de Estudio del Sandinismo, 1985). Neither Fonseca nor Borge were party to the assassination.

According to Tomás Borge, it is in 1955 that Fonseca begins to study and organize Sandino's thought. It is likely that Borge was mistaken about the date because Fonseca's writing does not mention Sandino until 1960.[36] Nevertheless, the point that Borge makes about the recovery of Sandino remains even if the date is incorrect. Borge (nd: 16). recalls hearing Fonseca tell someone, "'Sandino,' Carlos said on one occasion, 'is a kind of path. It would be frivolous to reduce him to a category or to one more anniversary among yearly disturbances. I think it's important to study his thought.'" Borge remembers Fonseca's joy and anger at discovering Somoza García's book El Verdadero Sandino. Somoza's efforts to delegitimize Sandino were precisely what appealed to Fonseca and the others. They also studied Salvatierra's book Sandino: o la tragedia de un pueblo, de Belausgoiguitia's work Con Sandino en Nicaragua, and Calderón's book Los últimos días de Sandino. A few years later in 1957 - 1958, two more works were available - Sandino, General de Hombres Libres and El pequeño ejército loco - by Argentine author Gregorio Selser (Borge, nd; Fonseca, 1981). It is unclear when Fonseca was able to see these books, but Fonseca (1981: 8) notes that it is interesting that "a person that has not one time breathed the air of Nicaragua, is precisely the one who has until now elaborated the most complete review of the facts surrounding of the Sandinista epic."

Fonseca travels to the Soviet Union in 1957 as representative of the National

[36] Matilde Zimmerman (2000) points out that, if Fonseca had truly begun studying Sandino in 1955, Sandino would have appeared in Fonseca's work much earlier than 1960. She suspects that the recovery of Sandino began in 1959. Zimmerman excuses Borge's mistake because he was writing from prison where he was tortured and suffering solitary confinement and had no reference information including calendars.

Socialist Party (PSN). Upon his return, he is questioned by agents from the Nicaraguan Office of National Security. During this interview, Fonseca demonstrates the beginnings of a reconstructed history that blends Marxism with Sandino's anti-imperialism although Fonseca is not here attributing it to Sandino. Fonseca declares that he himself is not a communist but that he is a Marxist. Furthermore, he says that "the solution to the problems that the Nicaraguan people suffer can be reached through a plan that achieves a policy that makes the country economically independent from North American imperialism and frees it from the pro-imperialist Nicaraguan forces" (Fonseca, 1981: 168). The book that results from his trip to the Soviet Union, Un nicaraguense en Moscú, offers lots of praise for the Soviet society but, again, does not mention Sandino.

Fonseca identifies the historical link between the current political discontent and Sandino in a 1960 document. He rails against the Somoza dictatorship and denounces the semi-colonial economic system that supports the Somozas and is imposed by the US. In particular, he focuses criticism on the National Guard, "the army that was created by the North American invaders" who were expelled by "the struggle of the Sandinista patriots" (Fonseca, 1981: 29). "The national political movement headed by that [Army in Defense of the National Sovereignty] is the most powerful movement that has risen in the history of the country..." extols Fonseca (1981: 37). He is even calling the new army the Army in Defense of the People - a name strikingly similar to the EDSNN. Most importantly, Fonseca (1981: 38) declares, "We are the descendants of Sandino..."

In countless future documents, Carlos Fonseca and other contemporary Sandinistas will link themselves and their revolution to Sandino and his army. They will decry the Somoza government and protest the United States' support of that government,

linking these enemies to Sandino's enemies. In doing so, the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional (FSLN) is reconstructing history in a way that gives their revolution historical meaning and continuity. A handful of Sandinista documents written by Carlos Fonseca, Tomás Borge, Sergio Ramírez, and Humberto Ortega, supplemented by others, demonstrate this reconstruction.

The period of 1961 to 1969 was a time of slowly building the revolutionary organization after a failed military action against Honduran troops and the National Guard at El Chaparral in 1959 in which Fonseca was shot through the lung. After El Chaparral, Fonseca decides that armed action is the only way to make revolutionary change in Nicaragua - a decision similar to the one made by Sandino after Ocotal (Fonseca, 1981). Fonseca, Borge and friend Silvio Mayorga found the Revolutionary Nicaraguan Youth (JRN). In a speech given in 1960, Fonseca and Mayorga pay homage to Sandino on the twenty-seventh anniversary of his assassination. The speech identifies Somoza García as the murderer, laments that Nicaraguans have not been able to channel their discontent with the regime, and expresses admiration for the triumph of the Cuban Revolution and the Venezuelan people's defeat of their dictator (Fonseca, 1981). Of course, they also criticize the Conservative party's failures to oust the Somozas as well as the United States' repeated interventions "against the people and national sovereignty" (Fonseca, 1981: 50). The speech concludes, "The Sandinista struggle demonstrated definitively that our people can deliver victorious battles against enemies that are materially very powerful" (Fonseca, 1981: 53).

Fonseca, Borge and Silvio Mayorga and several others form the New Nicaragua Movement in 1961. Later that year in Honduras, Fonseca, Borge and Mayorga along

with Santos López, meet.[37] Fonseca "suggests, fights for and wins" the argument that the new organization should be called the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional (Borge, nd: 28).[38] Sandino's name is used ever more frequently as the leadership, and then the membership, studies and incorporates more of Sandino's thought and actions into their own efforts. Often operating from just over the Honduran border, the FSLN robs banks for funds - "an act of economic recovery" - and periodically engages the Nicaraguan National Guard (Borge, nd: 41). By 1961, Colonel Santos López is training the group in mountain guerrilla tactics. Then in 1963, the group begins to organize labor, students, and intellectuals and to create clandestine cells. They publish Trinchera, the first publication of the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional.

Fonseca is captured and imprisoned in Nicaragua in June 1964. From jail, he writes Desde la cárcel, yo acuso a la dictadura (From jail, I accuse the dictatorship), which was published as a pamphlet that year (Fonseca, 1981). Fonseca lists numerous assassinations, beginning with the most recent, committed by the Somoza government. Finally, he cites "the shady assassination of Augusto César Sandino, Juan Pablo Umanzor and Francisco Estrada and hundreds of Sandinistas inside Wiwilí" (Fonseca, 1981: 232). While he says that the dictatorship accuses him of imaginary crimes, he accuses the Somozas of the specifically listed murders and of thirty years of assaulting

[37] Santos López fought with Sandino and narrowly escaped being murdered by the National Guard at Salvatierra's house the night Sandino was murdered.

[38] Borge's brief telling of these events make it appear that he, Fonseca and Mayorga had a meeting, formed the organization and then decided to incorporate Sandinista into the name. However, it seems that it was actually a process over some time rather than a single event or within a few days (Zimmerman, 2000).

the Nicaraguan people for the purpose of personal gain. Fonseca is turning the accusation around on the Somozas just as Sandino turned the label of 'bandit' back to the Yankee invaders. Additionally, Fonseca signs his accusation with "Patria libre o morir!" which is Sandino's traditional closing (Fonseca, 1981: 237).

The FSLN is quite small and largely engages in activity in the northern parts of Nicaragua. From time to time, the Sandinistas attempt offensive action but are consistently defeated. From 1963 to 1966, the FSLN takes the time to improve its organization among peasants and in urban areas while reducing its military efforts. In December 1967 the FSLN concentrates in Pancasán in central Nicaragua and remains there for about a year. The National Guard launches an attack against the Sandinistas in Pancasán that results in a brutal defeat for the FSLN and the deaths of several rebels including co-founder of the FSLN, Silvio Mayorga. (Fonseca, 1981). After Pancasán, Borge (nd: 46) claims, "Our political destiny is sealed. Sandino is no longer an anniversary, a yearly disturbance, but is a path."

Fonseca produces two documents in 1968 that are interesting in that they are so different from one another. One pays great homage to the General, and the other mentions him only briefly. The first, an article that appeared in a Costa Rican newspaper, briefly outlines the misery of the Nicaraguan people, the political domination and manipulation by the Somozas and the imperialism of the North Americans. The Somozas are "puppets chosen by imperialism," and the US ambassador ordered the murder of Sandino (Fonseca: 1981: 249). The FSLN now fights for the liberation of Nicaragua, the end of tyranny and imperialist domination and for a new life for the people. The article concludes, "Today the glorious banner of Sandino is raised and receives...worldwide

support. That banner will remain erect, in spite of all adversity, until the final victory" (Fonseca 1981: 250). The second article is interesting in that it barely mentions Sandino at all, even though it is lengthy, and it is a bit defensive about him. Sandino is mentioned as only one in a list of great revolutionary heroes and then later mentioned with Farabundo Martí.[39] Fonseca defends Sandino in three sentences against criticism that Sandino was only interested in national independence and not in class equality (Fonseca, 1981).

The Sandinistas issue two important documents in 1969 - important because one outlines the FSLN's plans for the country and the other provides an organized, relatively brief statement by Fonseca of his sense of Nicaraguan history in terms of the present problem. First, the FSLN issues the Historic Program of the FSLN.[40] The Program (FSLN, 1982: 13) clarifies the current problem very nicely:

> The people of Nicaragua suffer under subjugation to a reactionary and fascist cabal imposed by Yankee imperialism in 1932, the year Anastasio Somoza García was named commander in chief of the so-called National Guard.
> The Somozist cabal has reduced Nicaragua to the status of a neo-colony exploited by the Yankee monopolies and the country's oligarchic group.
> The present regime is politically unpopular and juridically illegal. The recognition and aid it gets from the North Americans is irrefutable proof of foreign interference in the affairs of Nicaragua.

The establishment of a revolutionary government is the solution to the problem, and it is the FSLN's role to achieve the solution. The Program then provides a rather exhaustive list of what, exactly, the FSLN plans to do once in power. The FSLN's assessment of the

[39] Martí was Sandino's secretary for a time until they parted ways because Sandino would not fully embrace communism. Martí later became the symbol for the Salvadoran revolution.
[40] The Historic Program of the FSLN is unsigned by a specific person but is apparently Fonseca's work.

historic problem is virtually identical to Sandino's but with modern, and perhaps more marxist, language. Most importantly for this study, the document never mentions Sandino, even in a list of Nicaraguan martyrs.

In the second document, Nicaragua: Hora Cero (Nicaragua: Zero Hour), Carlos Fonseca (1981) provides a much more detailed outline of Nicaraguan history that will appear in various versions throughout FSLN literature for years to come. First, Fonseca's statement of the problem is very similar to the one above, and he provides a lot of data to demonstrate the economic crisis and social problems in Nicaragua as well as demonstrating North American economic penetration and domination. Then, he condemns the Central American Defense Council (CONDECA)[41] as another Yankee tool to defend US business interests. Finally, Fonseca identifies, within the document, four major historical points - 1) Nicaragua has long been a victim of foreign aggression and oppression, 2) the Nicaraguan people do rebel, 3) revolution is the solution, and 4) Fonseca owes it to history and humanity to achieve the solution (Fonseca, 1981).

Fonseca's (1981: 78) first historical point is that "Nicaragua is a country that has suffered foreign aggression and oppression for more than four centuries." Initially, it was dominated by Spain. Then its east coast was controlled by England for 150 years. Finally, it "was chosen as the target of Yankee rapacity" and has been so for more than a century (Fonseca, 1981: 78). He then lists fifteen acts of Yankee aggression that Nicaragua has suffered. One of those acts tells the story of Sandino. He discusses

[41] CONDECA was formed in 1961 and included all the Central American countries except Costa Rica. Its principal purpose was to protect Central America against the spread of communism, particularly from Cuba, and to coordinate Central American military efforts with the US military (Booth, 1985).

Sandino's refusal to accept Moncada's agreement with Henry Stimson at Tipitapa in 1927. Sandino's guerrilla army engages the occupation forces more than 500 times thus forcing the Marines' evacuation. However, before leaving Nicaragua, the North Americans train and leave a surrogate army called the National Guard, headed by Anastasio Somoza García. The Guard, under Somoza's supervision and with instructions from the US ambassador, murder Sandino, even though Sandino was engaged in peace talks.

Next, Fonseca argues that Nicaraguans have a rich tradition of rebellion and have often taken up arms to fight foreign aggression and oppression beginning with fighting for independence from Spain. Interestingly, he does not mention the resistance of indigenous Nicaraguans during the conquest. However, he argues that the rebellions have not been successful in a lasting way because they have always been led by individuals. Therefore, when the individual leaders are absent, the movements cannot function and carry on the fight to a successful conclusion. Ultimately, the problem is that Nicaraguans lack a "profound revolutionary consciousness" (Fonseca, 1981: 81). In his analysis, the glory and the tragedy of the first Sandinsta resistance was that it was largely composed of peasants. It was glorious because the most humble Nicaraguans were involved, but it was tragic because they lacked political knowledge. Coupled with the illiteracy of the soldiers and many of the officers, Sandino's elimination left a gaping hole in their efforts that could not be filled. Other attempts to bring justice to Nicaragua between Sandino's murder and 1969 also failed because they suffered from a lack of revolutionary consciousness.

Now, the solution is, according to Nicaragua: Hora Cero, revolution driven by the Sandinista National Liberation Front. Previously, even the FSLN suffered from a lack of clarity of vision and unity of the revolutionary consciousness, says Fonseca. Nevertheless, the revolutionary leaders have the example of the Cuban revolution and understand how crucial it is to link revolutionary intellectuals to workers and peasants in order to build not only an organization with a revolutionary consciousness, but one that will not be dependent on one person. Furthermore, the FSLN has made a concerted effort to establish links to outside revolutionary groups thus providing a larger support network. Fonseca (1981: 95) writes, "The frustration that followed the period of the Sandinista resistance does not have to be repeated today...These days are not like those in which Sandino and his brother guerrillas battled alone against the Yankee empire." Now, they are linked to other revolutionaries who are fighting against the "empire of the dollar" and "the aggression of the blond beasts" (Fonseca, 1981: 95).

Finally, Fonseca definitively links this current struggle to Sandino in a more personal way. At various points in the document, Fonseca has already made many of those historical links. For example, the last reference to North Americans as "blond beasts" is a term that Sandino used. However, Fonseca (1981: 95) cements the link as he closes Nicaragua: Hora Cero:

> Before the image of Augusto César Sandino and Ernesto Ché Guevara, before the memory of the heroes and martyrs of Nicaragua, Latin America and all of Humanity, before history: I place my hand on the red and black flag that signifies "Free Homeland or Death,"[42] and I swear to defend with arms in hand the national honor and to fight for the redemption of the oppressed and exploited of Nicaragua and of the world. If I fulfill this oath, the liberation of Nicaragua and all people will

[42] The flag of Sandino's army was red and black, and "Free Homeland or Death" was their motto.

> be the prize; if I betray this oath, death in disgrace and dishonor will be my punishment.

Fonseca's view of history in Nicaragua: Hora Cero and the link to Sandino is important in order to understand more than Fonseca's thinking. The work is produced clandestinely on mimeograph and distributed. Therefore, it is an account of history that the FSLN uses to explain themselves to each other (Fonseca, 1981).

In August of 1969, Fonseca is arrested and jailed in Costa Rica. An attempt by Sandinistas to free him results in Humberto Ortega and another Sandinista being seriously wounded. A campaign of international pressure - a campaign that includes Jean Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir - to free the men is successful in October 1970. Fonseca goes to Cuba and remains there for four years. During that time, Fonseca writes several histories, analyses, and proclamations (Instituto de Estudio del Sandinismo, 1985).

Meanwhile, the FSLN has made great strides in becoming an insurgent force of some size and strength. They have reorganized, named Fonseca as General Secretary and have built a significant support base among the peasants as they gain peasant trust by living full time in the mountains. According to Borge (nd: 55), they "put on long pants to visit the mountains, hamlets, provinces, slums, factories, universities, institutes." Therefore, the Sandinistas try another action at Zinica and, this time, the peasants supply them with intelligence about the National Guard. The Sandinistas are buoyed because while Zinica was not a resounding military success for the FSLN, neither was it a humiliating defeat as had happened so many times before (Borge, nd; Booth, 1985; Hodges, 1986).

In 1969 and then again in 1970, Fonseca writes of Sandino as a Christ figure. The first document speaks of Christ and then likens Sandino to him. This document is mimeographed and distributed as a clandestine flyer (Instituto de Estudio del Sandinismo, 1985). Fonseca writes, (1981: 267),

> Two thousand years ago there was a redeemer who...said that his brothers were those who did the will of he who was in heaven...That is my brother and my sister, said that redeemer. Brother; Augusto César Sandino called those who accompanied him, pointing the warrior's gun in resistance against the Yankee aggressors.

In the 1970 document, he discusses the popular struggle between the years 1934 and 1958. When he mentions 1934, he calls it "the year of Augusto Cesar Sandino's crucifixion" (Fonseca, 1981: 272).

The year 1971 begins with the publication of Fonseca's oft cited biography of Sandino - Sandino, Guerrillero Proletario (Sandino, Proletarian Warrior). "Augusto César Sandino, worker of peasant origin that engaged in armed combat against the North American invaders in Nicaragua..." is Fonseca's opening sentence and opening description of Sandino (Fonseca, 1984a: 7). The booklet focuses on outlining the earlier years of Sandino's rebellion but also discusses the nature of Sandino's soldiers, US Marine behavior and Sandino's legacy. Fonseca briefly describes Sandino's exposure to Zeledón's fight against the Yankees, his exposure to social foment in Mexico and his employment by US companies. He tells the story of Sandino's decision to return to Nicaragua to fight with the Liberals and Henry Stimson's manipulation of the Nicaraguan situation including Moncada's betrayal of the nation. However, "Sandino, the most illustrious son of the Nicaraguan people, stood erect before the betrayal and went on clutching his weapon," continues Fonseca (1984a: 14).

Fonseca writes of Sandino's army. The Ejército Defensor de la Soberanía Nacional de Nicaragua (EDSNN) was composed of peasants and depended on non-combatant peasants for intelligence and other support. The peasants thought so positively of Sandino's soldiers that they affectionately called the soldiers *los muchachos* (the boys). The soldiers gave food, clothing and medicine to the peasants when they could, and it worked in the soldiers' favor in that "it developed patriotic resistance" among the peasants (Fonseca, 1984a: 22).

"In spite of material deprivation, the Sandinistas strengthened their spirit of sacrifice" and were honest whereas the invaders committed vandalism (Fonseca, 1984a: 23). Because the Yankees were so frustrated with their inability to eliminate the Sandinistas, they engaged in cruel and arbitrary repression against the population, says Fonseca. He tells of specific tortures and mutilations perpetrated by the Marines. Of course, Fonseca (1984a: 28) mentions the creation of the "armed mercenary force that was named the National Guard." He does note that some Nicaraguans in some of the Guard units revolted against Yankee commands.

The legacy left by Sandino is twofold, according to Fonseca. First, Sandino knew that defeating the military part of Yankee imperialism was not the same as ridding the country of Yankee economic and political interference. That work was still to be done. Second, Sandino had plans to form a third political party to begin that process in a limited way, but his murder destroyed those plans. "The tragedy that fell over Nicaragua...has been prolonged for several decades and even today flagellates the people of Sandino," says Fonseca (1984a: 48). Nevertheless, now Nicaraguans are not alone as many peoples, including Vietnam and Cuba, rebel against Yankee imperialism. Fonseca

(1984a: 49) closes Sandino, Guerrillero Proletario, "In this new battle, the young Nicaraguan generation, faithful to the legacy of Augusto César Sandino, proves with its blood, that it occupies a place of honor."

Still in Cuba, Fonseca (1981) writes the Cronología histórica de Nicaragua (Historical Chronology of Nicaragua), but it is not published. Even though followers do not see it before revolutionary victory, the study provides Fonseca's view of history. Like all his other recitations of history, this one focuses on the political and economic history of Nicaragua. It is organized in a list form with specific years marking points of interest. Interestingly, the language and style of this work are rather matter-of-fact until he discusses the year 1932, which is where he mentions Somoza's appointment as head of the National Guard.

There are three major themes in the chronology. First, Fonseca identifies various efforts by foreign interests to dominate Nicaragua. These efforts begin with the Spanish conquest and continue with Mexico's effort to annex Nicaragua, and the British domination of Nicaragua's Atlantic coast. Of course, the culmination of the imperialistic activities is the repeated attempts and successes of the United States to control the country, beginning with William Walker and his filibusterers in 1855.[43] Secondly, Fonseca cites numerous instances of Nicaraguan resistance to foreign intervention. The first to resist is Diriangén. The other individuals identified by name are President Zelaya, Benjamín Zeledón, Augusto César Sandino, Rigoberto López Pérez, General Ramón Raudales, and two contemporary Sandinista soldiers who were killed by the Somoza

[43] Surprisingly, Fonseca does not mention the Monroe Doctrine in the chronology.

government. There are other numerous mentions of nameless groups of Nicaraguans who resisted. Third, Fonseca specifies several persons who operated from self-interest and not patriotism. Interestingly, Fonseca mentions Sandino's traditional enemies, Emiliano Chamorro, Adolfo Díaz and Moncada, without editorial comment but implies that President Sacasa had significant responsibility for Somoza taking power. Not surprisingly, the Somoza family receives the most criticism in the chronology. With the first mention of Somoza García, Fonseca's fairly unemotional language turns to using terms like "electoral farce," "tyrant," and "barbarous" (Fonseca, 1981: 350).

The Managua earthquake occurs in December 1972. The National Guard's unprofessional behavior and Somoza's greed in the quake's aftermath were shocking and, finally, intolerable, to large numbers of observers. Guardsmen looted or simply left their duties to attend to their own families. When foreign aid poured into the country later, the Guard and Somoza pocketed or sold much of the aid. These shenanigans were obvious to Nicaraguans and to other governments as well. Even non-Sandinista groups in Nicaragua either began to organize or strengthened their organizations to demand change in the regime - either reformist or revolutionary (Booth, 1985; Bermann, 1986). Of course, the FSLN also gained strength as it provided an alternative to Somoza.

Meanwhile, Fonseca is still writing from Havana. One month after the earthquake, he writes a letter to Nicaraguan residents of the United States. "We all lament the consequences of the recent earthquake in Managua," writes Fonseca (1981: 154), "but you have to consider that such consequences are more serious due to the insane city planning policy" and "daily oppression" ...of the Somoza tyranny..." Then he

tells the expatriots that armed struggle will end in liberation "because the Sandinista Front is equipped with the ideals of Augusto César Sandino, ideals that day by day unite all Nicaraguans with a clean conscience" (Fonseca, 1981: 155).

In 1974 there are increased political demonstrations, labor unrest, and some hunger strikes demanding the release of Sandinista prisoners (Booth, 1985). From Cuba, Fonseca writes Crónica secreta: Augusto César Sandino ante sus verdugos (Secret Chronicle: Augusto César Sandino before his executioners), but it is only published in Cuba (Fonseca, 1981). Apparently, his purpose in writing the piece is to correct the lack of analysis of Sandino's participation in the peace talks with the Sacasa government. It is also a bit of apologia regarding criticisms that Sandino was naive about the danger surrounding him and about the trustworthiness of Sacasa and Somoza. Fonseca repeats several times that Sandino was fully aware that he was in danger and that he was wary of the peace process. However, Sandino participated as a point of personal honor and because he was acutely aware that the people desperately wanted peace.

The Crónica secreta differs from Fonseca's other treatments of Sandino in that it does treat the last moments of Sandino and his peace efforts. It is helpful to this study in that Fonseca (1981) addresses the official history of Sandino created after his murder. He says that the official history was created by the reactionary elements in Nicaragua and was spread by the press. This history says that Sandino was never a patriot and that the Yankee intervention was only a pretext that Sandino used so that he could commit crimes. Furthermore, the story goes, Sandino was no more than an advocate of war for war itself.

Fonseca's (1981) position is that US diplomats Matthew Hanna and Arthur Bliss Lane wanted Sandino killed and that Somoza and Crisanto Sacasa were complicit. In addition, the murder of Sandino had a classist aspect. "Generally only the assassination of the patriot that is the warrior Sandino is seen, but not seen is the assassination of the representative of the exploited and humiliated that is also the worker Sandino," explains Fonseca (1981: 419).

Instead of the Sandino of official history, the actual Sandino was unwilling to and uninterested in resting on his laurels, according to Fonseca. The Crónica secreta reminds readers that Sandino adopted a realistic attitude and sincerely worked for peace. Even after his murder, he remained in the memories of the "worthy Nicaraguan peasants who accompanied him from victory to victory" until he became a symbol of the Latin American struggle against Yankee imperialism (Fonseca, 1981: 415). For many years, organized popular resistance did not materialize, "but Augusto César Sandino remains as a clandestine national hero" (Fonseca, 1981: 424). Fonseca's (1981: 426) finale to the Crónica reads, "Although there's little left to do, the rattling of the foundations of imperialist domination in Latin America, in Africa, in the whole world feels like never before in history. It is the 'proletarian explosion' that Augusto César Sandino dreamed of."

Sergio Ramírez Mercado, one of Nicaragua's leading intellectuals, made two of the most significant contributions to the understanding of General Sandino's life and thought. From 1973 through 1975, he wrote El muchacho de Niquinohomo and edited El pensamiento vivo. El muchacho de Niquinohomo (The Boy from Niquinohomo) is a biography of Sandino, beginning with his birth and childhood, but focusing on the last

seven years of his life. Much of the same information in Fonseca's various renditions of Sandino's life are also included in Ramírez' account. However, Ramírez' work is less clinical in expression and, therefore, makes Sandino appear to be more of a complex human being. This work also differs from Fonseca's work in that Ramírez interspersed the story of Sandino with information about what was also occurring in the United States, at the time. For example, Ramírez mentions that public opinion in the US was turning against the Marine action in Nicaragua as more Marines were being killed. He also mentions debates in Congress as some Senators questioned whether Marines should be used to control "bandits" in Nicaragua when they were not performing the same service in Chicago against mobsters like Al Capone (Ramírez, 1988).

El pensamiento vivo in two volumes is a collection of writings by Augusto César Sandino. As editor, Ramírez tackles a monumental task of collecting and organizing these original letters, manifestos, articles and essays into two volumes that provide a firsthand look, without interpretation, at the General himself. Ramírez saves his own interpretation for the brief epilogue at the end of the second volume; however, the epilogue is not written until just after the revolutionary victory. Nevertheless, it provides Ramírez' point of view, even though he was one who was not involved with the military aspect of the FSLN.

Ramírez, of course, notes the colonial history of Nicaragua and the history of foreign intervention in the country. However, he pays particular attention to the role of the local elites in those interventions. "The dominant intermediate groups" never "baldly presented the Yankee interventions," writes Ramírez (1981: 426), "they came wrapped in ideological cellophane, in a cultural-ideological-political justification." The occupations

were presented “as saving, as civilizing” (Ramírez, 1981: 426). When Sandino appears, his task then is anti-oligarch and anti-imperialist and not as champion of working class interests. Conflict between the working class and capitalists is not the history of Nicaragua, according to Ramírez. Instead Nicaragua’s history is about Yankee intervention, the complicity of Nicaraguan oligarchs in that intervention, and the factional fighting between local oligarchs. Sandino “introduces for the first time the popular variable” (Ramírez, 1981: 430). He “is rescuing” the values of “sovereignty, autonomy, nationality to oppose imperialism in the concrete historical circumstances in which Nicaragua finds itself” (Ramírez, 1981: 436). Furthermore, the most concrete expression of Sandino’s thought is that he was anti-National Guard because he sees immediately the Guard as a factor in Yankee power over Nicaragua, and his opposition to the Guard cost him his life. Most importantly, Sandino’s anti-imperialist thought is thought with popular roots. Sandino struggle is on behalf of the humble, including workers, “who speak through his mouth” (Ramírez, 1981: 439).

Throughout 1974 the FSLN is again on the offensive thanks to increased organizational strength in both rural and urban areas as well as much more military experience (Booth, 1985). In December, the Frente accomplishes its most spectacular action to date. According to Bermann (1986: 256) “The Sandinista Front for National Liberation (FSLN) burst onto the world stage in December 1974 with a daring raid on a Christmas party given in honor of [US ambassador] Turner Shelton...” The Sandinistas were highly organized and apparently, well rehearsed because they rather easily took all the guests hostage within a short period of time after Shelton had left. The FSLN held their hostages for just over three days and won freedom for several Sandinista prisoners,

one million dollars in ransom, the reading of Sandinista proclamations over broadcast media and a flight to Cuba for the freed prisoners and the hostage-takers (Bermann, 1986; Booth, 1985). Ironically, after thirteen years of study, organizing, training, fighting and dying, the FSLN had become an overnight success. Unfortunately, with the success came three years of repression by Somoza (Bermann, 1986).

Two written works are completed in 1975, but neither is published until after the FSLN victory. One, by German Pomares Ordóñez, is his story of becoming one of the first members of the FSLN and of being a Sandinista guerrilla. Pomares was born poor in the Chinandega countryside in 1937. He remembers hearing, at age nineteen, of Somoza García's death and that Somoza's official history had taken hold with some Nicaraguans. "Some people said poor thing [that he was killed], he was the one who brought peace to Nicaragua, others [said] that it was a good thing..." he recalls (Pomares, 1989: 18). He opposes the Somozas so he joins the Conservative Youth, but the leader treats him and his friends poorly out of a prejudice against rural people. Pomares hears of another group that is against the country's entire political system of Conservative versus Liberal, and he joins them. The result is that he meets Carlos Fonseca, travels to Cuba, meets Castro and ultimately becomes one of the FSLN's comandantes.

Pomares never mentions Sandino in his book. However, he is well aware of the Sandinista link to the past through his relationship with Colonel Santos López. He meets Santos López in Cuba. Upon his return to Nicaragua, Pomares "goes to the mountain" - the term Sandinistas use for entering the guerrilla force - where López becomes his commander (1989: 32). Pomares mentions López numerous times as he describes several military actions, and speaks of him with great personal respect. "Colonel Santos

López speaks of the conditions on the mountain and the training consists of mock ambushes: [the last patrol] lies in ambush and [the] others [keep walking] without [getting involved in] what's happening with [the patrol behind]," explains Pomares (1989: 38). This tactic is one used repeatedly by Sandino's forces and now taught to the FSLN by their direct link to Sandino. López is not only his teacher, but he is the one to give Pomares his code name - *El Danto*.[44] Pomares (1989: 56) also mentions that there was contact with other "Old Sandinistas" when possible.

Tomás Borge clarifies the historical link provided by Santos López. In his book (to be discussed later), Borge (nd: 31) makes clear that Fonseca's recruitment of López was extremely purposeful, and the purpose was to make that historical link to Sandino:

> And so, two generations of Nicaraguans came together, linked by the historic presence of Sandinista thought...The relationship between Carlos and Colonel Santos López was not coincidental. The old and new generations of Sandinistas sought each other out in those dark times and found one another at the precise political moment. The old Sandinistas passed on their experiences, and we nurtured them in fields hungry for seeds and new perspectives. What was really taking place was the transference of all that which had been written about Sandino's struggle in the flesh, bones and words of the surviving veterans.

Colonel Santos López dies in 1965 in Havana due to an illness. Germán Pomares, *El Danto*, dies in May 1979, just one and one half months before the Sandinista victory.

The second work from 1975 is a biography of Sandino that is lengthier and more detailed than any Fonseca has previously written. Viva Sandino (Long live Sandino) is Carlos Fonseca's last major work regarding the General of Free Men. While the piece is written in Cuba in 1975 - 76, it is not published until after the FSLN's victory over

[44] A *danto* is a type of Central American bird.

Somoza. Essentially, it is an elaboration of the Cronología histórica de Nicaragua of 1972, which is addressed previously in this chapter. The first mention of Sandino is in the first sentence as Fonseca relates that it was Sandino whose image was before the First Conference of Solidarity of the People of Asia, Africa and Latin America in 1966. The major portion of the book tells the story of Nicaraguan history, according to Fonseca, and begins with Columbus' arrival in the Americas.[45] It ends with Sandino's murder in 1934 with a brief note about the hope finally offered to Nicaragua by the Cuban revolution and the Frente Sandinista (Fonseca, 1984b).

The first third of Viva Sandino is devoted to pre-Sandino history and the remainder devoted to again telling the story of Sandino's resistance. Throughout, the major themes are once again, foreign aggression and oppression in Nicaragua and a history of Nicaraguan resistance. This time, though, there are some new names mentioned as Nicaraguan heroes and a more consistent mixing of Sandino with class-conscious language. One of Fonseca's key points in Viva Sandino is that Sandino had widespread popular support. In fact, Sandino was the expression of Nicaraguan indignation against more than a century of deceit and betrayal. "Sandino is the apex of that ire," writes Fonseca (1984b: 75) as Sandino stands against the Yankees and the oligarchs.

Of course, Fonseca notes that Spain, England, Mexico and the United States have historically dominated and/or interfered in Nicaraguan affairs. In addition, Nicaraguans have always resisted, but generally without a lot of success yet with many martyrs and

[45] Interestingly, Fonseca has not mentioned Columbus in the previously discussed works.

heroes. He names heroes that he has listed before such as Chief Diriangén, Benjamín Zeledón, and, of course, Sandino. For the first time, he tells the story of Cleto Ordóñez, "a name that certainly has not received the just place that he deserves in the memory of the country's past" (Fonseca, 1984b: 19). Ordóñez led the Nicaraguan rebellion against Mexico's annexation of Nicaragua and Central America in 1821. Fonseca (1984b: 20) says that Ordóñez led a popular rebellion and that "the classist nature of the rebellion is indisputable." Fonseca also makes mention, for the first time, of the "Indian war" of 1881 in which mestizo peasants mounted an insurrection against the business people who were taking advantage of them. He cites Higinio Campos and Santos Martínez. "names ignored by the official history," as leaders of that rebellion (Fonseca, 1984b: 39). Interestingly, he (1984b: 40) then says, "The 'Indian war' of 1881 should be noted as the antecedent of the colossal guerrilla war that almost half a century later Augusto César Sandino headed." Most interesting is Fonseca's story of another fighter who, as did Sandino, refused to lay down his arms after Moncada signed the agreement with Stimson. The difference between Sandino and Francisco Sequeira is that Sequeira was soon killed by Yankee soldiers (Fonseca, 1984b).

Viva Sandino certainly outlines Yankee imperialism and betrayals by Nicaraguans who support the North Americans or, at least, fail to oppose them. General Moncada receives the routine criticism as do Emiliano Chamorro, Adolfo Díaz, Crisanto Sacasa, President Juan Bautista Sacasa and US Secretaries of State Elihu Root and Henry Stimson. Obviously, Somoza García is a member of the list of enemies of the Nicaraguan people, but his name does not appear until the last third of the book after Fonseca notes that the US forces the creation of an "armed mercenary force, practically a regular army

of occupation, known as the National Guard" (Fonseca, 1984b: 109). Fonseca also spends significant space detailing atrocities committed by the US Marines during the war with Sandino. For example, he tells of the drawing and quartering of children for sport and says that it was the Yankees who invented and first practiced the *corte de chaleco* (Fonseca, 1984b).

Perhaps most interesting to this study of how the past is reconstructed is Fonseca's discussion of Sandino and his efforts using Marxist terms. Fonseca is clear that Sandino was definitely not a communist; he even criticizes the Mexican communists for their treatment of Sandino. He does not specifically claim that Sandino was a Marxist, but regularly calls Sandino a "worker-peasant" (Fonseca, 1984b: 73). Many of the quotes from Sandino that Fonseca chooses to use in this work focus on workers.

Carlos Fonseca Amador dies in combat at Zinica in November 1976. He had returned to Nicaragua a year before and gone to the mountains. The National Guard detects Sandinista movements in September 1976 and attacks with helicopters. Fonseca suffers a wound in his leg. Almost two months later, Fonseca and several other Sandinistas confront a Guard unit. Fonseca and two others are killed in that encounter (Instituto de Estudio del Sandinismo, 1985).

Carlos, el amanecer ya no es una tentación (Carlos, the dawn is no longer a temptation), written in 1976 from prison, is Tomás Borge Martínez' tribute to his friend and co-founder of the Frente Sandinista. Borge recognizes Fonseca as the intellectual father and visionary of the contemporary Sandinistas. As Fonseca did, Borge also clearly understands the Frente's historical links to Sandino and mentions Sandino frequently throughout the book. He speaks of the earliest days when "we wrote vaguely but

fervently of Sandino" and how Sandino's murder defeated the popular will and left Nicaraguans without a revolutionary consciousness (Borge, nd: 9). "It was in this instant that Carlos Fonseca appeared," says Borge (nd: 16).

Borge's book is, again, generally, a tribute to Fonseca and focuses on Fonseca as leader while recounting events in the development of the FSLN as an organization and of the revolution. Throughout this chapter, Borge's words have been cited several times as he is one of the best sources about Fonseca. It is Borge who repeats Fonseca's speech that 'Sandino is a kind of path' and Borge who emphasizes that Colonel López ties the FSLN to Sandino. However, Borge's task is to praise Fonseca and so he does while often also paying tribute to Sandino. When Borge recognizes Fonseca's death, he mentions them in the same breath. "The revolution that gave birth to Fonseca is a mother who carries in her womb new and definitive answers: the victory of Sandino, the victory of the blood of Carlos, the victory always, heroes and martyrs," declares Borge (nd: 78).

The final document produced by an FSLN leader during the revolution that is considered here is by Humberto Ortega Saavedra. 50 años de lucha sandinista (50 Years of Sandinista Struggle) is written by Ortega in 1976 and published that year. Ortega's version of the Sandinista struggle is organized into three stages beginning with Sandino's revolution and its roots, then the period of revolutionary decline after Sandino's murder, and finally, the rebirth of revolutionary activity after López Pérez' assassination of Somoza García and lasting until the writing of this book.

Ortega is quite clear that Sandino and his followers have not only left a legacy of proven military and political tactics and strategy, but they have left an ideological legacy. "In the Nicaraguan historical context the Sandinista struggle represents a belligerent

expression of class struggle and clarifies the identification of the foreign invader with the oppressor," explains Ortega (1979: 10). He says that, as the anti-imperialist consciousness developed, so did a popular class consciousness, and he also calls Sandino a "worker-peasant" as did Fonseca. Furthermore, Sandino was a visionary as he saw the need for Latin American unity to "contain the imperialist conqueror" (Ortega, 1979: 30). Sandino's ideology had a "substantial revolutionary class component," and the revolutionary movement relied on "a true proletarian director at the head of the oppressed and exploited fighting against local and outside reactionary forces," writes Ortega (1979: 32, 33). He also claims that Sandino's army was able to count on mass participation in their efforts.

For Ortega, as for other Sandinistas, the FSLN continues Sandino's task. After Sandino's murder, the surviving Sandinista forces "were maintained to such an extent within the country as if they were with him" and were ready at any moment to immediately rejoin a revolutionary movement (Ortega, 1979: 95). The student movement of the 1950s then raised the image of Sandino and began to combine Marxist-Leninist doctrine with the Sandinista experience, and the FSLN was born. From their beginning to 1967, Ortega says that the contemporary Sandinistas came to understand and appreciate their history. Now, he continues, the FSLN has the same form as the EDSNN and is supported by the thought of Sandino and his strategy of popular revolutionary war (Ortega, 1979).

Pedro Joaquín Chamorro is assassinated in early 1978, igniting a general uprising against the Somoza government. Then the Sandinistas accomplish their most spectacular military action in 1978. Two dozen Sandinistas enter the National Palace and take

around two thousand hostages. Their hostages include high-ranking government officials, some Somoza family members and reporters. They won the release of dozens of Sandinista prisoners, cash and escape to Panama. The action again brought unmeasurable amounts of attention to the Sandinista cause (Booth 1985).

Support for the FSLN grew substantially, and in July 1979 the Frente Sandinista de Liberación is victorious over the Somoza regime. The Sandinistas take power as Anastasio Somoza Debayle leaves the country. Sandino's legacy has been fulfilled at last.

Communicating Nicaragua's Counterpast

Once the Sandinista Revolution succeeds, the winners are free to construct and impose any history they like. However, the revolutionaries must reconstruct a past and communicate it before they are victorious. In fact, that reconstructed past must directly counter Somoza's official history if the Sandinistas are to succeed at all. The question is how did they accomplish this task.

The first part of this chapter details how Sandinista leaders, particularly Carlos Fonseca Amador, recovered Sandino's story and thought and incorporated them into their own revolutionary interests. Fonseca and others repeatedly and consistently tell a story of ongoing foreign aggression and oppression - most often perpetrated by the United States - and of Nicaraguan resistance to the oppressors, emphasizing Sandino's efforts as the foremost example. However, Sandino is more than simply an example; he is the practical and ideological father of their contemporary revolution. Fonseca did not vacillate on that point. Yet agreement about Sandino's pre-eminence among a few FSLN

leaders alone does not constitute a counterpast that can necessarily fuel and sustain a revolution. The leaders must spread that word.

As discussed in Chapter Six, the Somoza regime tightly controlled the use of communications systems and technology as well as the education system. Additionally, the US government and US companies played some part in giving direction to communication and education in Nicaragua, and the US supported the Somozas. Thus the Somozas had made vigorous efforts to first vilify General Sandino, then to praise themselves and finally, to erase Sandino from the national consciousness. To a great degree, the regime was successful in those efforts. However, stories of Sandino never quite died, and the stories became a reconstructed history to counter the official history of the Somoza era.

Tomás Borge (1986: 49) captures simply the FSLN's formula for reaching the masses with their counterpast: study, propaganda, and organizing the exploited and oppressed masses. Over eighteen years, the Sandinistas were able to accomplish these tasks. While eighteen years seems like a long time, they had to "radically alter the treatment that has been given to this crucial period of fifty years [1926 - 1976] of our history," explains Humberto Ortega (1979: 9). According to Ortega, the dominant classes had built a history full of falsifications and spread it through mediocre textbooks and essays. That radical alteration had to confront the Somozas' official history of Sandino and Nicaraguan history and had to, at least, take into account the North American view of it since the Sandinistas argue that the US historically interferes with their sovereignty.

The Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional began slowly to communicate its reconstruction of Nicaragua's past by 1) FSLN leaders studying and writing about Sandino's thought and actions, 2) forming small clandestine study circles, 3) publishing, and 4) mass education later in the struggle. Of course, simple word-of-mouth helped spread the message as did any publicity that the Frente was able to garner. The first portion of this chapter traces Fonseca's and the FSLN's reconstruction of Sandino and of Nicaraguan history as they studied and wrote. Fonseca and all other Sandinista leaders, like Borge, Ramírez, Ortega, and Wheelock, internalized this counterpast, built upon it and spread it.

After the leadership acquired knowledge of the Sandinista counterpast, they then often participated in study circles. The period 1960 through 1967 was a time of birth and experimentation for the Frente, according to Ortega (1979). During this time, the FSLN created several clandestine operations in urban areas. These operations were conduits for the diffusion of propaganda and allowed the Sandinistas to run small training schools (Ortega, 1979). Beginning in 1963, the FSLN used Popular Civic Committees and its student arm, the Student Revolutionary Front (FER), to reach more and more people.

Omar Cabezas was recruited to the FSLN just after his high school graduation by FER member Leonel Rugama. Interestingly, Rugama spoke to him first of Marxism-Leninism and Ché Guevara. "I know and came to Sandino through Ché," testifies Cabezas (1985: 12), "...you have to be a Sandinista. There is no other path for the revolution in Nicaragua." He joined Rugama's study circle and spent three months studying, and then began organizing his own study circles and using them to recruit for

the FSLN. Cabezas (1985: 19) reports having "seven study circles going at one time" and then "running off study pamphlets" until dawn.

The experience of Francisco Rivera Quintero's recruitment into the Frente was quite different from that of Cabezas. Rivera's father had always expressed opposition to Somoza's regime and, when drunk, was likely to insult Guardsmen and shout something about death to Somoza and long live Sandino. Mostly, though, Rivera was attracted to Sandino and the FSLN through the example provided by his older brother. Filemón Rivera was once expelled from school for mentioning the name of Sandino and for saying that Nicaraguan history books hid the truth about Yankee intervention in Nicaragua. Filemón even gave a speech in which he said that Nicaragua's problem would only be solved by the "magic sword of Sandino" (Ramírez, 1989: 38). Francisco says that, when he joined the Frente, he was placed in a study circle and began reading Marx and learning of Sandino. Until that point, he knew only that Sandino was a forbidden name and that his father went to jail for saying it. Rivera (Ramírez, 1989: 52) explains further:

> ...[my father and brother] explained to me that Sandino had fought against the Yankees, that had invaded Nicaragua, and that Somoza had murdered Sandino.
> The sons of Somoza stayed in power, backed by the Yankees and the clandestine organization to which my brother belonged was called the Frente Sandinista; and he, for wanting to change the situation of the poor, they looked for him as if he were a murderer...To say Guard, to say Somoza was not a crime, and to say Sandino, to say Sandinista fighter was bad. Therefore, I was understanding on which side to be, on the side of the persecuted.

The next year, Rivera studied the history of Nicaragua in Havana under Fonseca and Ortega and Marxism under Wheelock.

The Sandinistas begin publishing a periodical as early as 1962. In 1961 various Sandinista groups joined together - Nationalist Revolutionary Youth, New Nicaragua Movement, Combatants of the Army in Defense of the National Sovereignty of Nicaragua. The new group immediately saw the need for a publication but were not able to publish until 1962. Trinchera was "the vehicle through which we got our war cry to the people," says Escobar (1978: 2). They published about 200 issues of Trinchera on a weekly basis, when possible, for seven years. Obviously, the process was difficult in that the Somoza regime was unfriendly to such activity, but even if conditions had been friendly, their resources were limited. For example, those weekly issues were not even produced on mimeograph but on a wooden press and publication of Trinchera ceased in 1969 but was renewed in 1978.

Trinchera's form and content were as one might expect a revolutionary publication to be. Especially in the early years, the copy was likely to be typed, and any graphics, including pictures and special lettering, were likely to be hand-drawn. The quality of the graphics improved over the years. The content certainly included written critiques of the Somoza government and news of Sandinista military activities. It also included political cartoons and various inspirational sayings. Of course, Trinchera made regular reference to Sandino with articles about him, the FSLN's link to him and quick references to Sandino in brief quotes and slogans.

In a 1979 Trinchera issue, one quite lengthy article about Sandino appeared on the forty-fifth anniversary of Sandino's assassination. The article tells the story of Sandino's revolutionary struggle and how he was murdered by the "bloody founder of the Somocist dictatorship that even now exploits and oppresses our non-compliant

people" (Trinchera, 1979: 8). It goes on to tell of how Sandino resolved to expel the Yankees from his homeland and how others betrayed it. Then the writer makes the historical link between Sandino and the FSLN (Trinchera, 1979: 8):

> Apart from his extraordinary personality as a nationalist and anti-imperialist, it is fitting to emphasize the indisputable historical contribution of General Sandino to the guerrilla war, becoming in a teacher of this method of revolutionary struggle that later would serve as a model for the world.
> [The Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional] recovered...the warrior flag of the General of Free Men...the FSLN and it combatants cover themselves with the glorious nationalist and anti-imperialist flag that General Sandino bequeathed to us.

Another page in the issue is full of quotes from Sandino focusing on themes of nationalism, sacrifice, internationalism and anti-Yankee sentiments. Slogans read, "Long live Sandino's people!", "To die for the Sandinista people is not to die, it is to plant in order to continue the harvest" and "Sandinistally fighting in the whole country" (Trinchera, 1979: 1, 4). Sprinkled throughout the issue are small drawings of Sandino's Stetson hat.

El Sandinista was also one of the official organs of the FSLN and filled some of the gap opened when Trinchera was out of publication. It contained much of the same type of information as did Trinchera. For example, a 1975 issue explains the current popular war as the result of a long "historical process whose highest expression was the patriotic and anti-imperialist war directed by Augusto César Sandino..." (El Sandinista, 1975: 9). The front page includes a drawing of Sandino holding a rifle. However, El Sandinista has a more practical side as well. There is an article that provides illustrated lessons on the types of arms suited to specific tasks and lessons on the types and preservation of food for guerrillas. Reminiscent of Sandino's orders, guerrillas are

specifically instructed not to take food from peasants no matter how great the hunger; Sandinistas must pay for food (El Sandinista, 1975).

The student arm of the FSLN, the Student Revolutionary Front (FER), had its own publication. While difficult to document, it may be that FER's publication, El Estudiante, had the most impact in spreading the FSLN's message and its counterpast because it could be somewhat more freely distributed than other publications. As autonomous entities, the National Autonomous University of Nicaragua at Managua and at León were off limits to the National Guard. Therefore, students could openly publish Sandinista literature. However, the publications could not leave campus unless smuggled out. So, people passed pamphlets in things like cigarette packages or toilet paper rolls. Yet, even if the publications remained on the campus, students read them and carried the information off campus in their memories.

The first issue of El Estudiante appeared in July 1970. It contained FER's self-definition - "an organization of study about the social, economic and political problem of our time" (El Estudiante, 1970: 17). The issue also contained two articles about Sandino and/or his legacy. Articles emphasizing the militant side of Sandino and his thought. "The Sandinista combatant is a social reformer that possesses a Political Moral superiority over all adversaries," says FER in one of the articles (El Estudiante, 1970). It goes on to mention that a ragtag army defeated, for the first time, the powerful North American imperialism through moral resolve. Sandino's quote - 'I will not sell or surrender myself: they have to defeat me' - appears in order for the writer to then say that it typifies Sandinista militants. A second article reprints one of Sandino's letters in order to point out that one only has to change the names in Sandino's letter, but the same

situation applies in both time periods. Furthermore, the answer to Nicargua's problem is in the historical process of the traditional political parties; they have not changed and they do not work because of Yankee intervention. Therefore, a third political force is necessary. In Sandino's time it was the Army in Defense of the National Sovereignty of Nicaragua, and today it is the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional (El Estudiante, 1975).

Throughout various issues of El Estudiante, the writers tell a familiar story of the imperialism of the United States and the "blond beasts of the North," and of oppression perpetrated by Somoza against average Nicaraguans and the complicity of Nicaragua's oligarchy, the "knot of traitors" (El Estudiante, 1974: 6). Moreover, "the Somoza's dynastic regime" are the "faithful servants of imperialism" (El Estudiante, 1974: 1). The publication describes "Sandino's Heroic Exploit that...achieved a popular meaning" and reminds readers that "the shadow of Sandino is also projected over the people, their patriotic struggle and with more force than ever his unresigned war cry: 'FREE HOMELAND OR DEATH" [original emphasis] (El Estudiante, 1974: 8). In addition to essays explaining historical links between Sandino and the Frente, FER also often uses a phrase as a quick reference to make that link. "THE FUTURE AND HISTORY BELONG TO US" [original emphasis], appears several times (El Estudiante, 1975: 13; 1976: 17). All of these issues of El Estudiante are punctuated by drawings of Sandino's silhouette.

Production of this literature is clandestine as the dangers to those who publish and distribute it are considerable. Beginning in the first years, Doris María Tijerino held major responsibilities in the Frente such as handling all the money, locating safe houses,

and she was in charge of publishing. She oversaw the printing of "bulletins, leaflets, and various propaganda materials" (Heyck, 1990: 63). For such activities, Tijerino was arrested, imprisoned and tortured several times. Rivera relates that his brother, Filemón kept a mimeograph machine hidden in the home of a carpenter (Ramírez, 1989). The carpenter first provided the safe house where Filemón produced propaganda flyers and later collaborated with the FSLN. Filemón was eventually killed by the Guard.

While the Frente is publishing and distributing its propaganda to Nicaraguans, it is also building and utilizing a network of contacts in other countries. Many of the articles and editorials that appear in Nicaraguan publications are reprinted in Sandinista publications abroad and vice versa. For example, the Gaceta Sandinista is published in Cuba, Mexico, Honduras, and the United States. Other examples are Sandino published in Costa Rica, Sandino Vive in Mexico, and Unidad Sandinista in Panama. These foreign publications can be quite lengthy and technologically sophisticated since they are not bound by the same constraints as are Trinchera, El Sandinista and El Estudiante.

In their effort to educate the Nicaraguan population regarding their message and counterpast, the Sandinistas could not rely solely on printed publications since the illiteracy rate in Nicaragua was around 60% as noted in the previous chapter. However, the study circles were clandestine and therefore, by definition, not widely available to the population. Broadcast media were not available to the Sandinistas due to the stranglehold that Somoza had on these enterprises. Nevertheless, the Sandinistas periodically were able to use radio to disseminate their message. Through armed action, the FSLN would seize a radio station long enough to read a statement over the airwaves (Borge, nd;

Fonseca, 1981). In addition, they would demand uncensored airtime to read statements as a condition of freeing Somocista hostages.

In 1978 the FSLN went on the air with Radio Sandino. It had morning and evening broadcasts and counted professional journalists among its participants. It provided news, made calls to join the revolution and even taught the population how to use weapons and make explosives (Rothschuh, 1986). While the effectiveness of these efforts cannot be measured, they surely had significant impact of one type or another since, as stated in the last chapter, every household was likely to have a transistor radio and depended on the radio for news. Again, "radio reache[d] more people in Nicaragua than any other medium, except, without doubt, word of mouth" (Ryan, 1970: 191). Mendieta (1979: 146) says that Radio Sandino became so strategically important that the National Guard "paid mercernaries in Costa Rica to trace and localize its frequency."

Word of mouth transmission of the Sandinista message occured in several ways. Omar Cabezas writes of Sandinista efforts to spread the gospel of Sandino by making him relevant to listeners and tailoring their explanations to them. For example, he (Cabezas, 1985: 37) reports great success in his work with Indians in Subtiava:

> And we started presenting the image of Sandino in Subtiava. The Indians had a leader, a historical figure, who more than any other was representative of their people: Adiac. We presented Sandino as an incarnation of Adiac, then Adiac as an incarnation of Sandino, but Sandino in the light of the Communist Manifesto, see? So from shack to shack, from Indian to Indian, ideas were circulating: Adiac...Sandino...class sturggle...vanguard...FSLN.

In order to convince peasants, Cabezas (1985: 210) explains using a variation of the same approach:

> We took hold of the campesinos' hands, broad, powerful, roughened hands. 'Those callouses,' we asked, 'how did you get them?' And they would tell us how they came from the machetes, from working the land. If they got those callouses from working the land, we asked, why did that land belong to the boss and not to them? We were trying to awaken the campesino to his own dream. We wanted to make him see that though the dream was dangerous - since it implied struggle - the land was their right. And we began to cultivate that dream. Through our political work many campesinos began partaking of that dream.

Another variation on word-of-mouth transmission of the Sandinista message was music. Carlos and Luis Enrique Mejía Godoy wrote songs that told the Sandinista story but also that had practical applications like instructions on how to use weapons (Rothschuh, 1986). Lyrics to the "FSLN Hymn," written by Carlos Mejía Godoy appeared in an issue of Trinchera (1978: 6) and one verse reads:

> The children of Sandino
> do not ever sell or surrender themselves
> We fight against the Yankee
> enemy of humanity.

According to Rothschuh (1986: 35), "These songs had a widespread national exposure and penetrated profoundly into the popular consciousness."

Finally, *pintas* (grafitti) were an effective tool for sending the Sandinista message. Cabezas (1986) says that students were the first to use *pintas*, but they were ultimately used in a systematic way as part of the political work of the FSLN. *Pintas* began in Managua but soon spread throughout the country. Their content might be threatening, humorous, informational or provide instructions. *Pintas* had to be very direct and had to take into consideration the current consciousness level of the masses, explains Cabezas (1986). For example, slogans about the FSLN specifically made more sense to people in 1978 than they would have in 1970.

When Cabezas was in college, he first saw *pintas* that spoke of Sandino. He walked out of his house one morning and saw "Viva Sandino" painted on a wall across the street. Cardenal (1990) recalls how striking it was the first time he realized that a *pinta* said "Sandino Vive" (Sandino Lives) instead of saying "Viva Sandino" (Long Live Sandino). "Sandino Vive" has more meaning, and it is often coupled with "Sandino Lives, the Struggle Continues," giving it a much more profound meaning than simply "Long Live Sandino" says Cardenal (1990).[46]

Cabezas (1986: 37) recalls that he wrote his first *pinta* "on the run, out of fear." In the early years, spray paint was unavailable so they used paint and a brush. One person painted while two others watched for National Guard. When the Guard found *pintas,* they threw black tar on them. It was one more form of censorship, says Cabezas (1986). The *pintas* were a way for average Nicaraguans to express their displeasure with the regime, but also gave the FSLN something of a measuring stick for understanding the level of popular support for the Sandinista agenda - the more *pintas,* the more support for the FSLN. Additionally, the number of *pintas* increased with growth of the FSLN's influence. According to Cabezas (1986: 37, 40), "...the *pintas*...tell the truth, the walls were always our accomplices" and "we took the walls away from the enemy."

Clearly, the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional was eminently successful in communicating its counterpast as it stood against Somoza's official past. The feat is quite remarkable given Somoza's power advantage over the Sandinistas to impose and maintain his version of history. During the last two years of the revolution, the popular

[46] See Sandino in the Streets (1990) for an excellent photographic essay of *pintas* of Sandino. The photographs were taken in the late 1980s so are not used in this work as data.

insurrection implied that Nicaraguans generally had come to, at least, reject Somoza's history and, at most, come to accept the FSLN's counterpast. As Ernesto Cardenal and Omar Cabezas said, grafitti about Sandino specifically and the FSLN generally was not uncommon before the victory and was very common afterward. A silhouette, a Stetson, a "Sandino Vive" or a "Patria libre o morir" were shorthand for recognition of the historical link between their own struggle and the struggle of a man forty-five years earlier.

The FSLN on Sandino

In order to make any kind of argument for revolution, the Sandinistas must reconstruct Nicaragua's past and present this counterpast to Nicaraguans. Obviously, agreement with the official past will not fuel a revolution. Neither will an argument that Somoza is simply a bad man who must leave the presidency. That argument was made by Conservatives and did not attract followers outside their party nor did it accomplish their goals. The eternal displacement of one political party by the other was Nicaragua's history; it did not constitute a reconstructed history that would counter not only the man and the regime, but that would also call into question the entire system of Nicaraguan politics and economics. Thus the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional offered a counterpast to Nicaraguans that had the potential to bring radical change.

Nicaraguan history, as reconstructed by Fonseca and the FSLN leadership, is understood and presented through a Marxist-Leninist filter. Therefore, the Sandino who leads the FSLN is cast as the worker-peasant - a presentation not necessarily contrary to how he presented himself but he did not focus on it quite as much as does the FSLN.

However, the FSLN's Sandino is still primarily nationalist and anti-imperialist, which is exactly how Sandino presented himself, and it is how Ramírez presents him.

There are a few things that the Sandinistas do not address about Sandino. They do not discuss, or even really mention, his religious beliefs and practices.[47] As seen in Chapter Four, Sandino was an unabashed spiritualist who was even proselytizing among his own officers. They also ignore that he was a Mason as were Somoza and several other figures during the period. Additionally, except for one document by Fonseca, the Sandinistas do not discuss Sandino's peacemaking unless they use it to make a point about his good faith compared to Somoza's bad faith. Lastly, they generally neglect the softer Sandino - the one who sometimes spoke of love and who seemed to know about and care for each of his soldiers. However, these images of Sandino were not necessarily useful to explain the FSLN's present.

The FSLN's reconstruction, as explained in this chapter, usually identifies four major historical points. First, there is repeated foreign aggression and oppression perpetrated against Nicaragua. These efforts at domination began with Spain and have included Mexico, England and, most importantly, the United States. US interest in Nicaragua is self-serving in that the US is specifically interested in using Nicaragua to further its business aims within the country but also to assure stability in the country so that US business may operate unimpeded within Central America and the hemisphere. Historically, the US government has been unconcerned for the welfare of Nicaraguans and is, therefore, unmoved by any problems caused by its domination of Nicaragua.

[47] See Donald C. Hodges, 1986 for discussion of Sandino's spiritual beliefs.

Neither is the US concerned with Nicaraguan sovereignty and the numerous interventions by Marines to impose North American domination demonstrate this disrespect.

Second, there is a history of Nicaraguan resistance to the foreigners. Chief Diriangén offered some resistance to the Spanish. Nicaraguans, including Cleto Ordóñez, resisted Mexican annexation, and others resisted Walker's attempt to bring Nicaragua directly under US domination. There have been various peasant rebellions against business interests throughout history, and General Zeledón was killed resisting Marine occupation of Nicaragua. In the successful assassination of Somoza García, López Pérez was the hero who brought justice to the dictator. Of course, Sandino is the primary example of Nicaraguan resistance, captures the Nicaraguan spirit, and was the one to beat the unbeatable Yankees. However, the spirit of resistance has not yet been combined with a revolutionary consciousness. Therefore, while resistance has been valiant and sometimes met with a measure of success, there has not yet been a complete success as the efforts have been too limited in thought and participation.

Third, some Nicaraguans have collaborated with the foreign aggressors and oppressors. Often it has been the Conservative party that has directly collaborated with the United States at the expense of average Nicaraguans. The cycle of one political party ousting the party in power never solves the problems of average Nicaraguans and, therefore, plays into the hands of the United States as the US then must step in to solve the problem. In Sandino's time, the problem was certainly direct Marine intervention but also the complicity of Nicaraguans like Moncada in allowing the US to do as it wished. However, since Sandino's death, the United States' army of occupation is not US forces but its surrogate, the Nicaraguan National Guard. In fact, Somoza is North America's

puppet and the last Marine. United States' support of Somoza means that the US ignores Somoza's abuses of power and the suffering of Nicaraguans. Yet, the United States does not just passively ignore the situation, but also exploits Nicaragua for its own purposes.

Fourth, Sandino is a path as he provides the historical example of how to solve these problems, and the FSLN will follow the path to victory. He was a worker-peasant of ordinary, humble origins. He was a fervent nationalist and anti-imperialist. Sandino was courageous, determined, politically astute and a brilliant military strategist. He was the only military officer willing to stand against the blond beasts. In spite of his enormous strength of will and character before an enemy, Sandino was kind and very attentive to his followers' concerns. He enjoyed the respect and loyalty of his soldiers, and was respected by the Nicaraguan people and had their support. Of supreme importance to the Sandinistas' case is that Sandino won.

Sandino was and is the redeemer, the path. He was the one who held the solution for Nicaragua, but his murder prevented him from implementing it. Although Sandino was but a whisper for many years, he lived on through Nicaraguan resistance until now when he is reconstructed by the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional to again lead Nicaraguans to defeat the oppressors. Besides, they can defeat the US because Sandino did. In fact, the Frente will fulfill Sandino's dream. And the contemporary Sandinistas still speak of him as their leader and Nicaragua's redeemer in a way that is more than respect for a fallen national hero. If Sandino were still alive, he would be pronounced charismatic.

Competing Reconstructions of History

Four understandings of Nicaragua's history, especially as the history pertains to General Augusto César Sandino, have been presented in these pages. Each one is directly relevant to the development, and even victory, of the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional in 1979. Sandino and his followers present an image of the General that serves as a standard of comparison for all other constructions of him. The United States presents an image of Sandino that legitimates its behavior but that will also serve as basis for Somoza's construction of an official history. Somoza presents understandings of Sandino and the United States that will support the legitimacy of his own regime. However, the FSLN reconstruction of history as a counterpast to Somoza's official history is the particular focus here, and within that focus, the adoption of a deceased Sandino and his cause and the posthumous attribution of charisma to him.

The Reconstructed Sandino

The contemporary Sandinista movement was born in response to what they perceived to be more than significant problems in their nation. In the processes of birth and development of their movement, the FSLN reconstructed a past in the Meadian sense of the term. Widespread distress or grievances had already existed for many years, and there had been some efforts at calling attention to the distress and acting to resolve it. However, an emergent event worthy of sparking the reconstruction of a past that would fuel a movement did not occur until the late fifties. Once that event occured and the Sandinistas collected, interpreted and organized evidence of a counterpast, then the Sandinistas were able to use that counterpast to drive a revolution that would ultimately be successful.

The situation in Nicaragua in the 1950s was more than difficult for the average Nicaraguan. The problem had been evident and identified for some time. The distress plaguing Nicaragua was identified by Conservatives like Pedro Joaquín Chamorro and by old Sandinistas, and the distress had been a constant for many years. Then came a small group of men, led by Carlos Fonseca, who not only articulated the distress but later reconstructed a past to explain it. Fonseca (1981: 39) pinpoints the general problem in a 1960 speech:

> The Nicaraguan people suffer one of the typical dictatorships of the oppressed countries of Latin America, with a semi-feudal and semi-colonial economic system...The principal instrument that serves to sustain the dictatorship is the National Guard...

Of course, they will identify the Untied States as the parent country to the neo-colony. In addition to the neo-colonial status of Nicaragua under the control of the United States, Humberto Ortega specifies the role of the Somoza regime in the problem. "The marked and constant repression and the vandalism done by the Somocist cabal to the administrative order" as well as the exploitation of workers in urban and rural areas are consistent problems, according to Ortega (1979: 87). Variations of Fonseca's and Ortega's outline of the problem to be solved appear in almost any and every Sandinista attempt to tell their story.

Mead says that a reconstruction of the past is triggered by an emergent event that must then be explained. In the case of the Sandinista reconstruction of a counterpast, it seems that it was not a single moment in time or even a single event that constitute the emergent. The emergent event for the Sandinistas did not bring the issue to their awareness; as stated above, many Nicaraguans were already aware of the abuses of the

Somozas. This emergent event simply brought everything into focus. It is actually two events that blend together into one, and they occur only after the lengthy prelude of distress. First, the onset and victory of the Cuban Revolution constitutes an enormously important event for Fonseca and his colleagues. They are keenly aware of Castro's efforts and have a deep respect for Guevara. However, the Sandinistas are not really concerned with reconstructing a counterpast that explains the Cuban situation. Instead, they see Cuba as a country with a situation of foreign aggression and oppression like Nicaragua. Furthermore, they, like many Latin Americans, are supremely impressed that the Cuban revolutionaries were able to defeat Batista who was supported by the United States. In fact, the Sandinistas will be the only other revolutionary force, out of several, to come to victory like the Cubans. Therefore, in the emergent event of the Cuban Revolution, the Sandinistas were using it to explain their own need for revolution. Fonseca (1981: 384) explains, "With the victory of the Cuban Revolution, the brilliance of the rebellious Nicaraguan spirit recovered." The Sandinistas harken back countless times to the success of the Cuban revolution. They also know that the Cubans, particularly Ché Guevara, used Sandino as a model for their guerrilla war.

The second emergent event is peculiar in that it seems that it may have developed into an emergent event years after it actually happened. The assassination of Somoza García in 1956 was unpredicted, quite novel and, therefore, an exception to standard interpretative categories in Mead's terms. Fonseca, Borge and Mayorga were already involved in anti-Somoza activities, but, given the multitude of references to Lopez' act, the assassination was extremely significant in terms of fueling hope and planning - yet not at that time. Apparently, the anti-violent activist group to which they belonged was

not in agreement with the assassination (Zimmerman, 2000). Yet, by the time the FSLN is formed and throughout the revolution, Fonseca and other Sandinistas refer to the "setttling of accounts" with Somoza as a pivotal event. There had certainly been previous attempts to oust Somoza. The Conservatives had tried unsuccessfully many times, and Sandinista General Colindres tried to mount a revolt in 1948. Then in 1956, Rigoberto López Pérez succeeded where others had failed, but he succeeded in an unexpected way. One of Fonseca's (1981: 355) summaries of the event reads:

> In an action of extraordinary heroism the patriot Rigoberto López Pérez sacrifices himself settling accounts with the tyrant A. Somoza G.; such an action is justified in a period in which the tyranny is prolonged while the popular struggle suffers a serious state of atrophy...

It was not only surprising that López Pérez succeeded in his attempt, but that he did so knowing that he would be killed. Until this time, Somoza's enemies tried to eliminate him while preventing any harm from coming to themselves. Therefore, López Pérez was attacking the same old problem but with a novel approach; and he was successful. Of course, his success was limited in that he did not eliminate the Somoza government. Nevertheless, the Sandinistas refer innumerable times to this historical event, sometimes seeking to explain it historically and sometimes using it as part of the explanation of the present.[48] The repression that followed the assassination may have added to the sense of it as the emergent event that Mead discusses.

It seems that the success of the Cuban revolution was the pivotal event for encouraging the Nicaraguans to emulate that success but with a Nicaraguan signature.

[48] Interestingly, Sandinistas rarely discuss Rigoberto López Pérez as a person; he is usually only a representation of his act of assassinating Somoza García.

Yet, now Fonseca and the Sandinistas can bring López Pérez' unexpected behavior and success in 1956 together with Castro's remarkable success in 1959 and the years leading to it, and they can reconstruct a Nicaraguan past that makes sense of López Pérez' feat and events in Cuba but in a Nicaraguan context. The past will include oppression by a dictator who deserves to be killed and a government that deserves to be overthrown. Ultimately, the reconstructed past will include the United States' role in the oppression and General Sandino's role in originally successfully opposing the oppressor. Once the Sandinistas begin to incorporate Sandino into their own history, they will provide a history to explain the long ago emergent event of Sandino's murder.

Second, Carlos Fonseca, Sergio Ramírez, Tomás Borge, Humberto Ortega and many other Sandinistas have a wealth of evidence on which to base their counterpast. They begin with the whispers of Sandino mentioned by Fonseca (1981). Borge's father and Camilo, Humberto and Daniel Ortega's father were both part of Sandino's struggle (Borge, 1990: 81). Cabezas (1985), Tijerino (Heyck, 1990), and Rivera (1989) all report hearing about Sandino from someone in their youth. The whispers about Sandino were likely to be sketchy, but they indicate that there were still witnesses. Furthermore, the Sandinistas had the examples of old Sandinistas like Generals Colindres and Raudales who each attempted military action against the dictatorship. Most importantly, they had the person and testimony of Colonel Santos López to tell them of Sandino and his struggle and to train them in Sandino's method of guerrilla fighting.

Beyond the whispers and testimonies, Fonseca and the others had access to some written works about Sandino. The works of Somoza García (1976), Salvatierra (1934), de Belaustegoiguitia (1934), Calderón (1934), and Selser (1981, 1986) were available to

and studied by the Sandinistas in the 1950s (Borge nd). Fonseca (1981) even notes the particular importance of Somoza's and Selser's books in his understanding of Sandino. Later, they were able to study interviews with Sandino and documents written by him. These sources were all crucial as there was other evidence that did not exist. There was no body, no grave, virtually no official history and people closest to Sandino were likely to be dead also.

Mead argues that the reconstruction of a past provides causal explanations for the emergent event. The distress or grievance being suffered by the Nicaraguan people was the tyranny of the Somoza regime, and the combination of Somoza García's assassination and the victory of the Cuban Revolution provided the emergent event to spawn or accelerate Fonseca's construction of a counterpast. At the heart of the causal explanation for Nicaragua's distress and for the emergent event is the exploitation of Nicaragua by the United States, particularly US capitalist interests. Quoted above is Fonseca's comment made in 1960 identifying the current distress as the tyranny of Somoza, the semi-colonial status of Nicaragua and the use of the National Guard to maintain this system. Then Fonseca links these three problems to the exploitation of Nicaraguans perpetrated by Yankee monopolies and the Nicaraguan capitalist class. Through the years, the Sandinistas will identify US Marine occupation of Nicaragua as simply a tool of US capitalist interests to keep Nicaragua in line; Sandino said the same thing.

The Sandinistas also identify Nicaraguan collaborators as sharing in the blame for the poor conditions in the country. Initially, Sandino cited General Moncada and Adolfo Díaz as the collaborators. The contemporary Sandinistas name them too but actually hold responsible the Liberal and Conservative parties they represent,

respectively. Both Sandino and the contemporary Sandinistas find the continual ousting of one party from power by the other to be tiresome, dysfunctional for the country and serving the interests of the United States. Of course, the most searing criticism is held for the Somoza family and the National Guard. As stated before, the Guard constitutes a surrogate army of occupation for the United States, and Somoza is the "last Marine" (Bermann, 1986).

The final piece of the causal explanation for the emergent event is Sandino's assassination, which certainly flows from Yankee domination and the complicity of the Nicaraguan elite. However, the Sandinistas argue numerous times that, had Sandino not been murdered, Nicaragua would not be suffering as it is. They mention countless times that Nicaraguan resistance to domination was silenced, except for a few interruptions, until the advent of the FSLN. While the resistance is quiet, the exploitation can continue unabated. Hence, a problem that was on the verge of improving, instead worsened because Sandino was eliminated from the mix.

The Importance of the Reconstructed Sandino

Obviously, Sandino's life and struggle is but one portion of Nicaragua's past. However, the manner in which the Sandinistas have reconstructed him and re-attributed charisma to him makes Sandino a focal point of their revolution that symbolizes a great deal more than the life of one man. As Mead suggests, the Sandinistas have reconstructed a past that provides meaning for their current circumstances, gives them a sense of continuity and order, and implies future direction. Once again, their writings provide a wealth of data.

As stated previously, Carlos Fonseca purposely reconstructed Sandino's thought so that it could become the driving ideological force in the newest phase of the Nicaraguan struggle against the Somozas and North American imperialism. According to Borge (nd), Fonseca gathered most of his information about Sandino from several written works, including Somoza's biography of Sandino. FSLN Commander Jaime Wheelock (1980b) laments the fact that Sandino's own writings regarding his political thought are fragmentary, consisting primarily of letters and written instructions to his officers. In the introduction to Fonseca's book about Sandino, Wheelock (1982: 13) discusses the difficult task which Fonseca set for himself in recovering Sandino's thought.[49] Wheelock continues and compliments Fonseca's historiography. Commander Tirado (1980: 125) calls Fonseca's study of Sandino "meticulous, scrupulous." In summary, the Sandinistas recognize the critical role played by Fonseca in the presentation of Sandino to Nicaraguans. They also seem to assume that he was correct and complete in his interpretation.

The Reconstructed Sandino and Sandinista Ideology

A primary reason that Fonseca rescued Sandino's thought was to provide the Nicaraguan revolutionary movement of the 1950s with an ideology. Fonseca "proclaimed before the entire revolutionary movement that Sandino's ideas were forceful" (Tirado, 1980: 125). For Fonseca, Sandino's ideas culminated in an ideology that was a crucial mix of anti-imperialism, nationalism, and Marxism-Leninism.[50]

---

[49] See first page of this chapter for Wheelock's comments.

[50] For a thorough discussion of Sandinista ideology, including the incorporation of Sandino's thought, see Donald C. Hodges, 1986. See also Donald C. Hodges, 1992.

The Sandinistas use Sandino to firmly establish their anti-imperialism as an historical position. "The resistance against Yankee aggression and greed is born in the depths of the history of our people," states Fonseca (1983: 289). That history includes "the image of Sandino as the symbol of traditional anti-imperialist struggle of Latin America" (Fonseca, 1982: 167). Furthermore, Escobar (1980) writes that Nicaraguans should study Sandino's anti-imperialism in order to fully understand what North American policy toward Latin America really represents.

In Sandino: Guerrillero Proletario, Fonseca (1984a) argues that, by the age of seventeen, Sandino understood that the degree of United States' intervention in Nicaragua was increasing. Carlos Fonseca also teaches that Sandino's work experience with US oil companies in Mexico and the San Albino mine in Nicaragua sharpened his hatred of US imperialism. Fonseca's characterization of the peace treaty of 1927 between Nicaraguan liberals and US representatives as an act of treason and surrender to the Yankee empire provides Sandino with the historical opportunity to defeat imperialism.

Sandino's anti-imperialism became part of a past that provided meaning for Fonseca's present. However, the problem in Fonseca's time was not one of military occupation of Nicaragua by the United States as was the case for Sandino. Nevertheless, the Sandinistas believed their country to be "occupied" by North Americans through the "last Marine" - Anastasio Somoza Debayle. A writer for the Mexican Gaceta Sandinista asserts that paying homage to Sandino and his anti-imperialism is equivalent to condemnation of Somoza and his crimes against the people of Nicaragua (Salazar, 1975). Humberto Ortega (1979: 10) offers the following historical linkage:

> The Army for the Defense of the National Sovereignty of Nicaragua.followed...an aggressive strategy and policy that boldly proved its effectiveness, that also left us with fundamental ideological motives. In the Nicaraguan historical context the Sandinista struggle represents a belligerent expression of class struggle and makes a clear identification of the foreign invader [the US] with the oppressor [Somoza], creating the awareness of the same enemy, an awareness that feeds the passion of our people, since tyranny is nothing other than a mask of imperialism in Nicaragua...

The Honduran Gaceta Sandinista (1976) notes that the Somoza dynasty has made it unnecessary for the United States to mount a new invasion of Nicaragua. Similarly, Sandinistas argue that not only US support of Somoza constitutes the new Yankee imperialism but also involved are North American corporations "from the famous United Fruit to the not less famous business of the recently deceased Howard Hughes" (Pierre-Charles, 1977). Therefore, the present problem of Somoza and US multi-national corporations engenders an anti-imperialist stance by Sandinistas, and, for Sandinistas, this anti-imperialism is directly related to Sandino's ideology.

An ideology of anti-imperialism implies an ideology of nationalism. The reconstructed Sandino provides the contemporary Sandinistas with a nationalistic past. Jaime Wheelock (Fonseca, 1984b: III)introduces Fonseca's book about Sandino with an explanation of why Fonseca chose to study Sandino's ideology:

> Carlos first decided on an ideology of Sandino precisely because the new generations of Sandinista soldiers in the great majority young people, peasants, exploited by the cities or students of humble origin, fundamentally aware of the depressing economic and political situation in Nicaragua, and of the necessity to raise arms against the dictatorship, needed primarily moral teaching, of dignity, of patriotism; in other words, of practical ideology reborn of the same roots as the struggle of the defense of the national sovereignty.

Escobar (1980: 73) agrees that Sandino's legacy to the Sandinistas was a fundamental principle "to arm theoretically and practically the national liberation movement."

Commander Humberto Ortega (1980: 13) makes clear that Sandinista ideology is nationalist in its origin: "[Sandinismo] was not a phenomenon brought theoretically or extracted from books, because Sandino precisely, without extracting from books extracted from the people their needs, made them his, interpreted them and he himself through his struggle, through his action, made theory, that which we have recovered."

Wheelock agrees that Sandino acquired his ideology directly from assuming the needs and oppression of the Nicaraguan people. However, Wheelock and others extend this nationalism to include all of Central America and/or Latin America. Wheelock (1982: 54) argues that Sandino's assumption of the problems of Nicaraguans matured "until [he was] elevated to the unquestionable category of founding father of Latin American anti-imperialism together with such figures as Bolívar, San Martín, José Martí, Betances, Camilo, y Che..." This great love of country and willingness to sacrifice for the good of the country expressed through Sandino provides the Sandinistas with an ideology as well as an example to emulate.

In addition to providing an ideology of anti-imperialism and nationalism, the reconstructed Sandino has accommodated Marxist-Leninist ideology. The idea that Sandino adhered to a Marxist-Leninist philosophy is controversial because there seems to be no direct evidence that he was a Marxist. Nevertheless, the Sandinistas regularly connect him with Marxists and Marxist ideas. For example, Carlos Fonseca (1981: 66) writes to university students that they should take a decisive stand in favor of revolution just like "the great revolutionaries of history: Karl Marx and Augusto César Sandino, Camilo Torres and Ernesto Che Guevara." Fonseca also reminds his readers of Sandino's working relationship with Farabundo Martí, the self-declared Marxist for whom the Salvadoran revolutionary is named. At one point, Fonseca clearly admits that Marxism

did not gain a real foothold in Nicaragua until after the Cuban revolution of 1959. The reason that Marxism did not arrive earlier in Nicaragua or Central America was that the Marxist ideas were "without the finishing touch of domestication" which a reconstructed Sandino eventually provided (Fonseca, 1981: 85).

The Sandinistas generally avoid calling Sandino a Marxist, but they write of his motivations and orientations in Marxist terms. Escobar (1980: 80) even discusses Sandino's ability, "without being a Marxist" to apply nationalism in a revolutionary way. Wheelock (1980: 115) also acknowledges Sandino's novel approach to fighting the war of 1926:

> If the "constitutionalist" war of 26 appears at first glance like any other conflict between factions of the dominant class, its real driving force and that which will permit it to later transform itself into a struggle of national and anti-imperialist liberation, is precisely the active participation, of classes of agricultural laborers, peasants, and workers - among these last the participation of the mine workers that constituted at that time the most united group of that sector is decisive.

In addition to leading a class struggle, Sandino understood the concept of class. According to Fonseca (1982), Sandino represented popular interests. Humberto Ortega (1980) argues further that the Army for the Defense of the National Sovereignty Nicaragua and Sandino were not simply fighting to oust the Yankees. They were also slowly gaining a class consciousness in order to find a real historical alternative to the deplorable conditions in Nicaragua. According to the Sandinistas, Sandino gained his "worker consciousness" through his own experience and contact with miners and banana plantation workers (Pierre-Charles, 1977; Fonseca, 1980).

Wheelock (1980: 52) finds it surprising that Sandino acted in such close accordance with the "most advanced social ideas of the time, and [obtained an]

ideological-practical identification with a scientific conception of social processes that, given the backwardness of revolutionary ideas in the country and the incipient nature of the worker's movement, [while] not knowing its rigorously doctrinal aspect..." Ortega (1979: 33) declares Sandino to be "the true proletarian leader of the oppressed and exploited." Sandino's class experience and vision "were crucial at the moment of correctly explaining the issue of the composition of the anti-imperialist vanguard" (Wheelock, 1980). For Escobar (1980: 79), it is clear that Sandino was class conscious in the Marxist-Leninist sense, and "the idea that Sandino only wanted to expel the North Americans from the country and leave the political work to others" is completely false.

In conclusion, the contemporary Sandinistas faced the problem of providing meaning for their activities by developing a strong intellectual position. In Sandino's thought, they found an ideology that neatly meshed with their own ideas of anti-imperialism, nationalism, and Marxism-Leninism. Fonseca personalized, in a sense, for the average Nicaraguan the struggle against Somoza by spreading the FSLN's intellectual past back to a Nicaraguan who had waged a similar struggle.

The Reconstruction of Sandino and Continuity

The contemporary Sandinistas have succeeded in demonstrating that their situation is a continuation of Sandino's circumstances. The problem of US intervention continues albeit in a form different from Sandino's time. The struggle against Yankee hegemony continues. In addition to reconstructing a past which brings continuity, the Sandinistas have imposed order on their past. They have integrated the activities and goals of the Sandinista National Liberation Front with a past in a way that legitimizes their present.

It is clear to contemporary Sandinistas that the problems they face in the 1960s are a continuation of the problems that plagued Nicaragua in the 1920s. According to one Nicaraguan who lived during Sandino's war, the situation in contemporary Nicaragua is "the same, the same, the same" with the National Guard "burning, killing, this and that, here and there" (Hernández, 1986). Just as Sandino's concern was to expel the occupation force of US Marines from his country and restore Nicaraguan sovereignty and self-determination, Carlos Fonseca seeks to do the same. Even though there is no contingent of Marines occupying Nicaragua in the 1960s, Fonseca (1981: 75) identifies the Somozas and the National Guard as surrogates for the US government. Somoza García "surrenders the country to imperialist interests," and he represents no one but the National Guard and Yankee interests (Wheelock, 1980: 10). His son, Somoza Debayle, is a "gorilla" and a "puppet" whose "immoral actions are always directed toward pleasing Yankee imperialism, which is what maintains him in power" (Fonseca, 1981: 249). Wheelock (1983: 62) notes that "the struggle against Somoza was a struggle against empire; not a struggle against the United States as a country but struggle against an imperialist conception in the United States government, because Somoza was a creation of imperialism."

In addition to fighting the surrogate US occupation forces - Somoza and the National Guard - the Sandinistas face the continuing problem of the presence of North American economic interests. Fonseca (1981: 75) summarizes the problem by saying that foreign interests exploit Nicaragua's resources while "the surrender of the national wealth to Yankee monopolies has continued to increase." He characterizes the extraction of Nicaragua's minerals by US companies as "the Yankee assault on our minerals

perpetrated without interruption for more than fifty years" (Fonseca, 1981: 231). Once again, he is noting the continuity of the problem.

Just as the US military supports its surrogates in the National Guard, North American business utilizes the Nicaraguan business community. The Nicaraguan upper class "has counted not only on the financial backing of great North American capital, but principally on the support of military, diplomatic, cultural, and policing interventions by North American imperialism" (Wheelock, 1980: 147). Commander Wheelock continues by listing powerful US financial institutions that back the Nicaraguan bourgeoisie - Chase Manhatten Bank, Wells Fargo Bank, and First National Bank of Boston. Morales Avilés (1980: 16) lists seven US banks with tremendous investments in Nicaragua after stating that "in Nicaragua there does not exist one single [public works] project, a project for production, programs for production...that is not financed by loans."

The Sandinistas also view regional alliances as contemporary tools of the continuing problem of US exploitation in Nicaragua. Salazar (1975) argues that the Central American Defense Council (CONDECA) is simply an arm of the Pentagon intended to control the Central American population. President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress is a "masquerade of reformist demagoguery" supported financially by the Nicaraguan bourgeoisie and by multinational corporations (Wheelock, 1980: 127). For Nicaragua, the Alliance means further integration into the economic hegemony of the United States, further foreign support for Somoza's military dictatorship, agrarian reform which only serves to expand internal markets for capitalists, and the "massive establishment of North American industrial firms that not only monopolized ownership of new manufacturing plants, but surrendered control of a large part of the traditional

industries operating in the country" (Wheelock, 1980: 128). In the final analysis, Wheelock (1980: 133) believes that Nicaragua and Central America are reduced to providing a "base of operations" for the United States. As such, according to Wheelock, the US encourages internal repression and invests heavily in Nicaragua in order to maintain control of the country.

Not only has the problem of North American domination of Nicaragua continued since Sandino's time, but the struggle against that domination continues. Of course, the Sandinistas view their war against Somoza as the continuation of Sandino's guerrilla against the US Marines. Humberto Ortega (1979: 73) draws a clear connection:

> This revolutionary task, for which Sandino, Umanzor, Estrada and the rest of the soldiers fell, is that which currently continues in conditions more favorable to the Nicaraguan revolutionary movement, the SANDINISTA NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT (FSLN).

Ortega (1979) accuses the Somoza regime of hiding and lying about the true history of Sandinista struggle since the initiation of Sandino's war in 1926 until the present. Ortega's purpose then is to correct this lapse in historical truths as he states:

> ...the war of General Sandino in the mountains of Segovias...far from being exhausted in a moment of the process that was developing during the period mentioned, has been permanently igniting the struggle of the last fifty years, and is serving without doubt to ignite once again, the historic crusade of our people, with its political and military at the head, in order to demolish tyranny.

Fonseca (1981: 137) delights in his observation that "in the country and even more so in the mountains Sandino is a part of the present," and provides, therefore, a fertile ground for recruiting soldiers and soliciting support for the FSLN. Most importantly, the Sandinistas place themselves and their struggle in an historical context which allows

them "to take advantage of...all and each one of Sandino's teachings and apply them to new social situations" (Tunnermann, 1983: 33).

The Sandinistas claim that the assumption that the death of Sandino signaled the end of Sandinista struggle is a false one. In fact, Mendieta (1979) claims that the toppling of Somoza García's regime began when he ordered the execution of Sandino. "After they killed General Sandino, the Yankees believed that all was finished, but it was not so..." according to one Sandinista (Rugama, 1986: 294). In fact, after Sandino's murder, "the regrouping of the popular forces, notwithstanding, is slowly being accomplished since the end of the decade of the fifties, even forming a vanguard of anti-somocist struggle which, in dedication to General Sandino, takes the name Sandinista National Liberation Front."

The current struggle continues to be violent as was Sandino's war. Baltodano (1977: 16) mentions that Sandino "create[d] an army of the people in which we fight today." Fonseca (1981: 251) warns President Lyndon Johnson that "the machete of Augusto César Sandino and Pedro Altamirano will be lifted again over the heads of the monsters that torture the humbled people." In very broad terms, the Sandinistas view all violent conflicts against US-supported Latin American governments as extensions of Sandino's efforts.

The establishment of continuity between the contemporary revolution and Sandino provides an historical anchor for the Sandinistas, but it also provides a sense of temporal order. Citing the initiation of Sandino's struggle as the initiation of their own struggle provides the revolution with an historical beginning. The Sandinistas have also designated a middle phase and an end of the struggle. Consequently, their past assumes a logical order which can be understood and communicated.

When Sandinistas speak of a history of North American intervention, they often begin in the 1850s with the invasion by William Walker. However, Sandinistas generally trace the beginning of their revolutionary conflict to 1927 - the year that Sandino began his fight. The primary example of this phenomenon is Humberto Ortega's book, 50 Years of Sandinista Struggle. Ortega (1979: 11) defines the beginning of the Sandinista revolution and predicts victory by stating, "...in an hour that we believe is not very far away, the process of nationalist, popular, and anti-imperialist struggle initiated by General Sandino fifty years ago, must soon enter a new victorious phase..." However, this first phase of the revolution ended prematurely when "the criminal hand of Anastasio Somoza García and the North American government, cut short Sandinista aspirations, the night of February 21, 1934" (Gaceta Sandinista, 1978: 1).

The middle phase of the Sandinista revolution begins after the assassination of Sandino. Fonseca (1980: 32) writes, "The tragedy that fell over Nicaragua from the crime of February 21, has been prolonged for several decades and still today flagellates Sandino's people." In response to a reporter's question about what happened to Sandino's memory between 1934 and 1958, Fonseca (1981) answered that his name was a whisper and that those years were spent in darkness and terror. In essence, the period from 1934 to 1958 is confused, directionless, and without leadership. The situation begins to change with the death of Somoza García in 1956.

The Sandinistas date the third and current phase of their struggle from one of two different events. At times, they claim that the period of darkness ends with the shots fired by Rigoberto López Pérez in 1956. Wheelock (1980: 58) says that López' action "opens for Nicaragua a new period of hope and liberty" and "marks the renewal of Sandino's struggle." On the other hand, Carlos Fonseca sets the date for the third phase in 1958 for

two reasons. One reason is that news of the Cuban revolution was having an increasing influence on restless Nicaraguans. However, Fonseca (1981: 217) cites a second reason:

> In that year 58...for the first time in a long time the name of Augusto César Sandino resounds again, after a quarter of a century of darkness, of paralysis, of atrophy of the Nicaraguan popular movement. In 1958 there is also the first guerrilla action in the country headed by a survivor of the old guerrillas of Sandino: Ramón Raudales, who died in that battle.

Of course, this last stage is characterized by the leadership of the FSLN. The years of darkness were simply an interruption, but now Nicaraguans "have substituted the Army for the Defense of the National Sovereignty of Nicaragua...with the glorious SANDINISTA NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT" (Salazar, 1975: 20). In fact, Borge (nd: 50) argues that "the FSLN was an historical answer" to Nicaragua's problems.

In summary, the members of the Sandinista National Liberation Front view their efforts as the historical continuation of General Sandino's struggle against foreign domination of his homeland. For the Sandinistas, the original problem facing Nicaraguans continues. The United States continues to dominate Nicaraguan politics and economics, although the domination is achieved through a Nicaraguan and economic penetration rather than military occupation. Due to the continuing problem, the Sandinistas continue to fight on behalf of Sandino in order to find a solution. Finally, the Sandinistas have ordered their past in such a way that they can identify specific phases of the conflict and causal conditions.

The Reconstruction of Sandino and the Future

Establishing that the FSLN's present derives meaning and continuity from a past that focuses on Sandino as the central character, Nicaragua's future becomes somewhat predictable. The contemporary Sandinistas can take Sandino and the past that they have

reconstructed around him and project a victorious future. The FSLN will defeat their enemies militarily, and they will usher in the fulfillment of Sandino's dream for Nicaragua.

The contemporary Sandinistas laud Sandino's military victory over the United States Marines. They then extend this past into a future military victory over Somoza and the National Guard. Carlos Fonseca (1980: 23) recognizes Sandino's determination to win a victory: "With simple language [Sandino] explained to the peasant warriors that the people would definitively defeat Yankee imperialism." The reward for Sandino's determination was indeed a military victory. Humberto Ortega (1980: 10) states, "Sandino does not sell himself to the empire, he continues to fight until he achieves the expulsion of the invader in 1933."

The FSLN continually and directly links Sandino's victory to their own predicted victory. For instance, "...Sandino, interpreting the feeling of the great masses of the people, takes up arms and launches his manifesto to the nation...the guidance that would drive the struggle of the Nicaraguan people and that today inspires the battles of Nicaragua's revolutionary organization" (Pierre-Charles, 1977: 5). Jaime Wheelock (1982: 59) explains specifically:

> The challenge fell to the new generations to fulfill the Sandinista heritage and advance the program of national liberation completed in its military aspect by Sandino who threw out the invading North American troops in 1933. Because of that, the prime objective - and precisely the task that Sandino planned to complete as an immediate step - for the revolutionary movement of today is the defeat of military tyranny...The defeat of the Somozas presents itself as a historical continuation of the Nicaraguan revolutionary process...

Not only is military action like Sandino's effort likely to bring victory to the FSLN, but it is the only road to victory. According to Fonseca (1980: 33), "The national

emancipation of Nicaragua, will be obtained through armed action, sustained by the popular masses and guided by the most advanced revolutionary principles." Tirado (1980: 126) confirms that Fonseca taught that armed struggle was the only means of victory and that Fonseca "adopt[ed] this idea from Sandino." However, Fonseca (1981: 95, 125) does not forget that Sandino's victory was thwarted by Somoza García:

> The frustration that followed the period of Sandinista resistance does not have to be repeated today. Now the times are different. These days are not like those in which Sandino and his warrior brothers fought alone against the Yankee empire.
>
> We believe that the heroic military feat that Augusto César Sandino commanded is insuperable. We must say that whatever the dimension of the military of the current belligerent situation, they will always be less than the dimension reached by Sandino's deeds...It could be said that in its entirety the situation in which the Nicaraguan revolutionary struggle occurs today is more advantageous than it was in the days of Sandino...

In fact, the United States will not return to defeat the Nicaraguan people because the US would not only be fighting a guerrilla movement like that of Sandino "but an entire nation that is willing to fight to the last man" (Wheelock, 1983: 72).

The ultimate military victory over the US-backed Nicaraguan dictator will allow Sandino's dream for his people to be fulfilled. However, Sandino's dream is no longer just his; his dream has become the dream of the Nicaraguan people. The Gaceta Sandinista (1976: 3) explains, "[Sandino's] ideal of making Nicaragua a free homeland is planted in the heart of the Nicaraguan people..." Another edition of the Gaceta (1978: 1) carries this statement: "At last it will be possible to reach the objectives traced by Sandino and recovered by the people themselves."

Of course, Sandino's vision was to liberate Nicaragua from Yankee domination for the good of the Nicaraguan people. This very practical vision remains the same. Fonseca (1981: 257) remarks, "The Sandinista National Liberation Front, FSLN, continues the path traveled by Sandino...as the only way to stop the crimes, the hunger, the illiteracy, and the misery...Before the sacred image of its martyrs [the people] swear once more to not lay aside their guns and to drive the revolutionary struggle for the people's happiness."

In addition to being practical, the Sandinistas also become romantic when writing of fulfilling Sandino's dream. Fonseca (1980: 32) writes that after Sandino's murder and "during a quarter of a century of pain and combat, around 25,000 children of Nicaragua, fertilized the holy ground, that will one day see the relentless flowering of liberty and justice." Similarly, Borge (nd: 78) comments:

> Tomorrow, some day, soon, a greatly changed sun will shine and illuminate the land that our heroes and martyrs promised us; land with abundant rivers of milk and honey where all fruits flower, except the fruit of discord and where man will be brother to man and love, generosity, and heroism will reign and at whose doors our people will be a guardian angel that with a sword of fire will prevent the return of selfishness, arrogance, vanity, corruption, violence and cruel and aggressive exploitation of some against others.

In essence, the Sandinistas have spread their present backward into a victorious and visionary past that they then project into the future. Consequently, they speak and write of a future Nicaragua that will be a place of which Sandino could only dream. The FSLN will make this dream into a reality through the promise of military victory based on Sandino's military legacy.

Sandino and Posthumous Charisma

The contemporary Sandinistas harbor a strong allegiance to General Sandino. Clearly, they deeply respect him as a national hero. They also admire his accomplishment of moving from miserable beginnings to leading a powerful and successful military force. They appreciate his dignity as a man. However, there is so much more to it than respect, admiration, and appreciation. For the Sandinistas, Sandino is the Nicaraguan people, and they are Sandino. There is a loyalty to him, not just to his memory. While Sandinistas know that Sandino is dead and even recognize the anniversary of his death each year, they keep him alive by speaking of him as if he were alive. If he were alive, these phenomena might indicate that he is a charismatic leader. But he is dead. Nevertheless, Sandinistas make innumerable statements that indicate exceptional or even divine qualities, his continuing authority over them, and an emotional commitment to him. Therefore, the question arises as to whether there may be a variation of Weber's charisma.

The Exceptional Sandino

Sandino was, at the very least, quite exceptional in the eyes of contemporary Sandinistas. He is, at the very most, divine. He was and is a David before Goliath (Selser, 1981). He was and is the "synthesis of a people's desire for liberty" (Ortega, 1983: 19). "The roving General traversed the conscience of the Asian and African peoples," writes Borge (1984: 163). These comments indicate that Sandino is a person which Sandinistas perceive as capturing the soul of the oppressed peoples of the world.

The Sandinistas also describe Sandino and his actions in terms that imply a divine nature. Fonseca (1982: 42) swears to defend his homeland "before the image of

Sandino." In addition, Sandino was a part of the "redemption of the enslaved peasant" (Fonseca, 1983: 238). The Sandinistas count time from his death much as the western world does from Christ's death (Ortega, 1979; Blandón, 1981; Wheelock, 1982). He also is described by Sandinistas as having done things in ways that are strikingly similar to Christ's actions. For example, Ramírez (Sandino, 1981: 31) describes a scene not unlike Christ's prayer in the Garden of Getsemane: ". . . Sandino separates himself from his men so that they will mot see him crying, while he bitterly meditates on the eternal destiny of the nation . . ."

The images most strikingly similar to Christ are those concerning Sandino's death. Some of the references made to his death and immortality are couched in very secular terms but sound religious. For example, the Gaceta Sandinista (1976) states, "After forty-two years the immortal Sandino, emerged with more vital force and his figure feels closer as that moment complete his work comes closer." More specifically, FSLN co-founder Tomás Borge (1985: 106) speaks of the group's history:

> Those who killed Sandino believed they had killed the revolution. They believed they had killed even the possibility of a revolution. . . Nonetheless, history . . . is regulated by laws that operate independently of the will of individuals. So, in this concrete case, those who sought to wipe out the memory of the man who became even more than the architect of the Nicaraguan people were mistaken once again . . . Hence the bullet that killed Sandino did not mark the end but rather the prologue to a new principle . . .

In other words, Sandino is just as powerful, if not more powerful, after death. The "laws" that Borge mentions are, like "destiny," eternal forces that control the situation.

The references become more religious than Borge's comment. Sergio Ramírez (Sandino, 1981: 31) recounts that Sandino decided to resist Yankee invasion, "with the

desire to sacrifice himself as a future example rather than with pretensions of military victory." In addition to self-sacrifice, Sandino has other Christ-like qualities according to his followers. He is reported by Sandinistas to have made a comment which is very similar to one that Christ made to his disciples before death on the cross. Sandino said, "Take courage Nicaraguans! I will be with you in an hour that is close at hand" (Wheelock, 1982: 153). Fonseca (1981: 272) specifically refers to 1934 as the year of Sandino's "crucifixion." Daniel Ortega (1983: 19), while president of Nicaragua, wrote that when the United States once again invades Nicaragua, "Then the vigorous figure of Augusto César Sandino will rise up" to lead the Nicaraguan people to another victory against the invaders.

In a prayer written to Sandino, Sandino sits at "the right hand of Father Bolívar," the liberator of five Latin American countries in the 1800s (Valdes, 1935: 228). He is also resurrected and lives within "the work of liberation," "the workers of the earth," "the immense effort of the Revolutionary Government," "the city workers, mine workers, fishermen," "the Popular Sandinista Army," "the National Police," and "the Sandinista militias" (Wheelock, 1980: 2).

Yet though Sandino has exceptional, even divine, qualities, much of his appeal resides in his ordinariness. Conger (1989) argues that the charismatic leader has a unique sensitivity to the constituents' needs, and that connection is mentioned many times by followers (IES, 1986). The FSLN also identifies Sandino's connection to ordinary people as they speak of him as a worker, a peasant, and a Nicaraguan. The followings of other Nicaraguan leaders who were not perceived as somewhat ordinary and, therefore, connected to the people, were smaller and were not as broad-based as that of the Sandinistas. Of course, the contradiction is that the charismatic leader is both

extraordinary and ordinary. Again, Conger (1989: 22) says that the charismatic leader is able to articulate an “extraordinary vision rather than ordinary goals,” is able to build trust in his/her vision among constituents and then convince followers that they can achieve the vision.

In summary, the Sandinistas speak of Sandino as if he were the only human that could understand and represent the Nicaraguan people even today. In part, he can accomplish that task because he is one of them. They also speak of and to him as if he has conquered his own death and continues to lead and watch over them. There is no evidence that Sandinistas truly believe Sandino was physically resurrected, but they seem to believe in his spiritual resurrection thus imputing a divine quality to him. As a contemporary Sandinista proclaims, "Sandino yesterday, Sandino today, Sandino forever!" (González, 1985: 98). This quote is strikingly similar to a biblical quote from Hebrews 13:8, "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever!"

Sandino’s Authority

Sandino's authority over followers seems to remain intact after his death even though he cannot give direct orders. Sandinistas often mention that Sandino's thought and teaching are the foundation for their involvement in the renewed armed struggle against imperialism (Tirado, 1980; Fonseca, 1981; Wheelock, 1982; Fonseca, 1983). Borge (1984: 143) says that, in the triumph of the current revolutionary movement, Sandino still "plays a decisive role."

Contemporary Sandinistas claim to have inherited Sandino's authority. Therefore, they invoke his name and authority as one means of driving a revolution. For

example, Daniel Ortega (1985: 203) claims, "A new Sandinista consciousness . . . makes us worthy sons of Sandino." According to the Gaceta Sandinista (1978: 21), Silvio Mayorga was a son of Sandino who "would be a follower of Sandinista thought and would fulfill the sacred duty of fighting for a free Nicaragua." Humberto Ortega (1980: 13) asserts that the Sandinistas neither invented the fundamental aspects of their revolution, nor did they derive Sandinismo from theories or books; they retrieve from Sandino himself "those fundamental elements that permit us to place ourselves at the front of the people and carry the people to freedom . . ."

One of the most telling comments by Sandinistas which points to Sandino's continuing authority discusses how the FSLN purposefully instills it in the people. The FSLN views it as necessary to its own development to impart Sandino's thought to its core members as well as to the masses. They admit, "In this way, the Sandinista morality gained strength among the people, and rescued our national values in order to bring them face to face, as a stronger force against imperialism and its instrument of penetration and oppression: the military dictatorship of Somoza" (Instituto de Estudio del Sandinismo, 1982: 81).

Perhaps Carlos Fonseca best describes the acceptance of Sandino's authority by past and present Sandinistas. The following previously cited quote by Fonseca (1980: 65) compares Sandino to Christ and alludes to Sandino's perceived divinity as well as his authority:

> Two thousand years ago there was a redeemer who...said that his brothers were those who did the will of he that was in heaven where according to him, came justice and truth.

> That is my brother and my sister, said that redeemer. BROTHER, Augusto César Sandino called to those who accompanied him brandishing the warrior's gun in the resistance against the Yankee aggressor.

Fonseca continues that the Sandinistas of the 1970s are also obligated to be Sandino's "brothers." Fonseca (1983: 263) makes his point directly by stating, "We obey the international rallying cry launched by Augusto César Sandino from the mountains of Segovias."

In conclusion, past and present followers and enemies of Sandino recognize that Sandino wields extraordinary authority over his followers. These followers are ready to sacrifice a family life for him. They are ashamed when found to be in disobedience to Sandino's authority. Sandino's disciples still are ready to die under his orders. "...the people of Sandino will fight to the death but full of faith in the victory," promises El Estudiante (1976: 21).

Commitment to Sandino

The emotional commitment to Sandino and his cause seems as strong after his death and in contemporary Nicaragua as it was in Sandino's time. Not long after his death, a man writes,

> Edified by your apostolate and martyrdom, I give homage to your memory, outlining your outstanding countenance and how it is engraved in my spirit, with indelible respectful admiration and containing a brief history of the resplendent epic poem of your life.
> (Fabela, 193?: 39)

These words not only depict overwhelming emotional commitment to a deceased leader, but they also demonstrate that the commitment springs from a belief in Sandino's exceptional or divine qualities and vice versa.

It appears that the Sandinistas are committed to Sandino and his cause if by no other means than by their adoption of his name. For example, Borge (1984: 143) enumerates Sandinista views concerning the relationship between nationalism and internationalism and concludes, "All this is summarized for us by the name Augusto César Sandino, and the fact that we call ourselves Sandinistas." Ortega (1979) notes that the FSLN continues the revolutionary task begun by the fallen Sandino, and the FSLN also believes in Sandino's strategy for revolution. Wheelock (1980b) agrees that, even after so many years have passed, Sandino's method of revolution is extraordinarily relevant.

The Sandinistas not only have a strong emotional commitment to Sandino today, but believe the commitment will remain. Fonseca (1980) reveals the depth of current commitment by writing that young people are willing to prove with their blood that they are faithful to Sandino's legacy. Perhaps Tomás Borge (1982: 139) best captured Sandinista sentiments:

> Sandino's cause has indeed gone on living, and the Sandinista front did no more than take it up again under different material conditions and with the guidance of a revolutionary theory. Sandino's cause defied dangers and betrayals and turned the vacillators into pillars of salt. Sandino's cause lives and will go on living.

Therefore, emotional commitment to Sandino and his fight against foreign intervention is still meaningful to contemporary Sandinistas as it was to Nicaraguans of the 1920s and 1930s. His followers from then and now profess great loyalty to him and offer him words that sound worshipful. They take his struggle seriously enough to continue it decades after his death. In addition, the Sandinistas during the revolution continue to demonstrate their submission to Sandino's authority by expressing their belief

in him and by risking their personal safety in order to obey his call to the struggle. Finally, Sandino's past and current followers record their thoughts of him as being uniquely qualified, either due to his superhuman or divine qualities, to lead Nicaragua into freedom from foreign intervention. He is not simply a great national hero. For Nicaraguans who are Sandino's followers, he is the incarnation of their hopes and dreams and cultural values.

Conditions for Posthumous Charisma

After establishing Sandino's continuing charisma, one must wonder which conditions make this phenomenon possible. The solution can only be inferred through the manner in which Sandinistas write about Sandino. What subjects are important to Sandinistas? There seem to be four prevalent topics of discussion in Sandinista literature that may constitute conditions for the rebirth of charisma for a deceased charismatic individual:

1. Sandino's personal success in ousting the Marines.
2. Sandino's assassination and martyrdom.
3. The return of the initial problem - foreign intervention - after Sandino's death.
4. Carlos Fonseca purposely reminded the country of Sandino and his struggle.

These four conditions seem to combine neatly to provide Sandino with renewed charismatic qualities.

Of course, Sandinista literature records innumerable accolades to Sandino for his success in ridding Nicaragua of the United States occupation forces. They use the most lavish praise for Sandino when describing Sandino's act of successfully "begin[ning] the struggle against intervention, opening the phase of national liberation (Wheelock. 1981:

192). In his book Victorious December, Wheelock (1982: 99) continues to praise Sandino's success as the "heroic rebellion of the General of Free Men...who...for the first time in Latin America defeated the power and ability of the Marine infantry of the United States of America." Sandinistas are in awe when extolling their belief that the United States "could not defeat Sandino" (Tunnermann, 1983: 9).

The Sandinistas admit that they either hoped to or did emulate Sandino's success. Fonseca (1982: 250) raises "the glorious banner of Sandino" and is driven by the "deep anti-imperialist conviction of General Sandino" that expelled the Yankees from Nicaragua. Commander Carrión (1980: 53) tells students that the FSLN has inherited, "not by coincidence," the traditions, ideals, and objectives of Sandino and his army who managed to defeat the greatest military power of the time.

Such admiration of Sandino's success is more than common in Sandinista literature. Obviously, the point is extremely important to them noted simply by the extensive references to it in their rhetoric and writing. In order to understand the relevance of success to Sandino's posthumous charisma, consider Zeledón. Zeledón preceded Sandino by only a few years in protesting and fighting the Marine occupation. However, Zeledón was killed before his cause gained widespread adherence and, certainly, before he had an chance of succeeding. Consequently, Zeledón is remembered by Sandinistas as a hero but nothing more. Commander Wheelock (1982: 76) makes the point clear:

> ...the heroes of 1912...under the command of General Benjamín Zeledón made tenacious resistance against the Yankee invade...now it is necessary to complete the work of Sandino and the Nicaraguan patriots who succeeded in 1933 in expelling the American troops...

Zeledón is to be remembered, but Sandino continues to live through the people who continue his work. It is important to this analysis that Wheelock recognizes that Zeledón and Sandino had the same goal, yet he says that the Sandinistas must "complete the work of Sandino."

Willner (1984) asserts that the person who overcomes overwhelming obstacles is likely to be elevated to heroic or charismatic status. She also mentions that, in addition to successfully completing the difficult task, another factor may increase its perceived difficulty. If others, such as Zeledón, have made "previous and unsuccessful attempts...to accomplish the task," then success such as Sandino's becomes extremely important and awe-inspiring. Willner (1984) continues that the leader who challenges the status quo not only opens himself/herself to particular risks but also is usually challenging a system stronger than himself/herself. Heroes are often those who pit themselves against overwhelming odds. As noted previously, Sandinistas identify Sandino as a type of David against the Goliath United States.

Therefore, it seems to be a fundamental condition for Sandino's continuing charisma that he was successful in driving the Marines out of Nicaragua. Willner (1984) writes that even a defeated charismatic leader may continue to command a following. However, it seems important to the Sandinistas, and thus to Sandino's posthumous charisma, that Sandino succeeded. Even if, in reality, the Marines left for other reasons in addition to Sandino's opposition, as Booth (1985) asserts, it is central to the attribution of charisma that the Sandinistas credit the withdrawal of the Marines to the success of Sandino's struggle.

Concerning the second condition, the Sandinistas constantly make reference to Sandino's assassination and martyrdom. It is of course, also useful to place the blame for his murder on the United States and/or Somoza and his National Guard. For example, on the second anniversary of the 1979 Sandinista Revolution, Borge (1982: 134) asked, "Who assassinated Sandino and celebrated in an orgy of champagne and blood?"

The twenty-first of February - the date of Sandino's murder - is recognized each year in Nicaragua. Using the date to recall Sandino's murder provides the Sandinistas with a yearly opportunity to focus the attention of their people on Sandino's sacrifice for them. Sandino's sacrifice then stands as an example to be imitated in the struggle against imperialism. The Nicaraguans must remember that "the tragedy that fell upon Nicaragua due to the crime of February 21 has been prolonged for several decades and even today tortures the life of Sandino's people" (Fonseca, 1980: 71).

The murder of Sandino provides an ultimate symbol of decades of suffering for the Nicaraguan people. Fonseca (1980: 71) reiterates many times, "The despicable assassination of the Nicaraguan hero is the culmination of twenty-five years of crimes committed by the Yankee aggressors and the traitorous oligarchy..." As a symbol of their suffering and of injustice, the manner of Sandino's death serves as a call to unity among Nicaraguans against the perceived source of their suffering. They keep Sandino alive by promising to right the wrong committed against him and them.

The assassination of Sandino threw his followers into confusion for a few years, thus achieving Somoza's short term goal of ridding Nicaragua of a troublemaker. However, the act also elevated Sandino to the status of martyr, and it is extremely difficult to fight against a martyr. His followers extolled and romanticized Sandino's

good and charismatic qualities more after death than before. The last verse of a Nicaraguan poem written after Sandino's death illustrates the point:

> You have fallen, last great American chief, but wounded in the back, assassinated in a cowardly way in the night shadows, assaulted by the same sons of the earth that accompanied the Yankee in search of you when, from the mountains you pronounced the Ten Commandments of honor to the entire human race (Calero, 1983: 226).

In spite of Sandino's success in ousting the Marines, Sandino's death and the rise of the National Guard brought Nicaragua back to the pre-civil war conditions of tolerating foreign intervention. As indication of the third condition, contemporary Sandinistas fill pages and books exposing the terrible excesses and cruelty of the Somoza regime and the regime's deference to the will of the United States.

While Nicaragua was no longer occupied by US forces, it was still dominated by US interests. Fonseca (1980: 29) laments, "Although Sandino defeats the military intervention of Yankee imperialism, it is not possible for him to avoid the continuation of economic and political domination." On the other hand, Wheelock (1982: 70) takes the argument one step further and calls the National Guard a "true army of occupation." Borge (1984: 155) adds to the argument that not only was the National Guard a new army of occupation, but the United States purposely "looked for and found the formula which would assure continued domination over Nicaragua." The formula was, of course, the National Guard.

Because conditions of foreign intervention returned or continued, the struggle had to continue in spite of Sandino's death. Therefore, it was useful to keep Sandino's memory alive through the FSLN. Sandino's death became martyrdom and was transformed by the Sandinistas into a beginning rather than an end. According to Borge

(1984: 52) "...the shots that killed Sandino were not an end but prologue to a new beginning, to a leap that begins with a calling to persistence, to found the Sandinista National Liberation Front." Consequently, the FSLN is fulfilling its duty to Sandino of "denouncing before the Nicaraguan people and the world the shameful situation and the abuses suffered by Nicaraguans at this moment" (Wheelock, 1982: 87).

Even before Sandino's murder but after the signing of the peace treaties, Sandinistas were less than optimistic about the abilities of the US and the national oligarchy to allow Nicaragua its sovereignty. General Estrada (1983: 171) warned, "...one day...we will have to return to the fight..." Apparently, Estrada knew the future that Ramírez lived. Ramírez (1985: 332) addresses an audience saying:

> But Sandino is very much a part of the contemporary scene. His actions were not separate from the historical circumstances in which he lived; they were the direct result of a contradiction, a confrontation between Nicaragua and imperialism. And since this contradiction has not disappeared, the man and his deeds live on.

Given Weber's statement that charismatic leaders arrive in times of distress, it is understandable that regression to imperialistic times in Nicaragua provided the stage for a charismatic actor. Interestingly, it was a dead charismatic leader who filled at least some of the void. Lenin filled a similar vacuum. Tumarkin (1983: 267) notes that "the cult of Lenin developed during a desperately confused period in early Soviet history." She continues that by following a deceased leader, the followers need not suffer Lenin's abuse of power. The cult is also useful to the government as a means of legitimizing Soviet policy and glorifying the nation while distracting notice of defect in the Soviet system.

Although she is speaking of living leaders, Willner (1984) agrees that charismatic leadership promotes the growth of a nation and national unity. The leader provides a tangible embodiment of the abstract and remote entity known as the state. Therefore, the imputation of charisma to a deceased Sandino in the face of renewed foreign intervention serves to unify the Nicaraguan people in the name of a man who they view as caring enough for them to die for them. Contrary to Willner's statement, Sandino cannot provide the tangible embodiment of the Nicaraguan state or even the revolution. However, he does provide all his charismatic qualities, his well-known sacrifice, and most importantly, his cause which is to relieve Nicaragua of the source of its distress. Lastly, he provides a faithful disciple, Carlos Fonseca, who can become the embodiment of Sandino and his revolution.

Constituting the fourth condition, Carlos Fonseca Amador was responsible for rescuing the ideas of Sandino from obscurity.[51] Sandinistas admit that Sandino's cause was devastated by his murder. They often cite the assassination of Somoza García as "the resumption of Sandino's struggle" (Wheelock, 1980: 58). However, in a country without "direction, nor organization, nor revolutionary conscience," the oligarchy and the US exercised hegemony over political activity in Nicaragua. Fortunately, "in that moment Carlos Fonseca appeared" (Borge, 1984: 19).

Apparently, Fonseca was inspired by the example set by Fidel Castro and the Cuban revolution against oligarchy and foreign intervention. Fonseca envisioned a similar revolution in Nicaragua but tailored to Nicaraguan needs and culture. Thus,

[51] For a more thorough study of Carlos Fonseca, see Matilde Zimmerman, 2000.

Fonseca dedicated himself to the recovery of Sandino's thought. In the 1960s, Foneca's goal was not only to rescue Sandino's political and revolutionary legacy, but to start a new revolutionary movement based on Sandino's ideas. Wheelock (1983) adds that Fonseca was obsessed by his work of continuing Sandino's struggle through the FSLN.

Borge (nd) also reminds the reader that Fonseca was not the only founder of the FSLN. A group of men studied Sandino's thought and analyzed it. However, he still credits Fonseca with being the force behind the recovery and for making Sandino's doctrine relevant to contemporary Nicaragua. "I believe, and I am absolutely convinced...that by converting Sandinismo into the doctrine of the Frente, Carlos found the key and the originality of the Nicaraguan revolution," writes Borge (nd: 125).

Hodges (1986) points out that Fonseca used only those portions of Sandino's thought useful to providing an ideology for a new revolutionary movement. It seems that Fonseca neglected Sandino's more bizarre ideas. However, ignoring unattractive aspects of the charismatic leader is typical of followers. Hodges does admit that the Institute for the Study of Sandinismo (created after the FSLN's 1979 victory) has been making public a more realistic image of Sandino. Nevertheless, Sandinismo is still the driving force behind the Nicaraguan evolution, and "Sandino's patriotic ideas and example prevail in matters of ideology" (Hodges, 1986: 196).

A logical question at this point would concern the possibility of Fonseca being charismatic. While this study does not systematically analyze those data, the matter of Fonseca's charisma seems questionable. While he receives extraordinary credit and even praise from Sandinistas, the more personal and emotional aspects of the charismatic

relationship do not seem to be present. Sandinistas call Fonseca a great leader and extremely intelligent but do not speak of personal loyalty to him or of having a unique relationship with him. However, whether he was or was not charismatic, what affects Sandino's posthumous charisma is the fact that someone - in this case Fonseca - retrieved Sandino's name and thought from oblivion and helped to recreate its charismatic qualities.

On the other hand, perhaps Fonseca was charismatic and derived some of his charisma from Sandino's charisma. Willner (1984: 63) believes that the charismatic leader "is seen as the contemporary personification of one or more of the pantheon of dominant culture heroes and in turn, he becomes a culture hero." It must also be remembered that Sandino's charisma did remain among his followers - as demonstrated in the many poems, songs, letters, and books of the 1930s - for a few years immediately after his death and before his name became a whisper. In any case, it was necessary that a living person present Sandino's ideas in order to initiate the new revolution.

Regardless of who derived charisma from whom, Fonseca was instrumental in using Sandino's thought as a catalyst for the FSLN movement. Fonseca's political and organizational skills provided the hands and feet for Sandino's charisma and its revival. Tumarkin (1983: 258) notes that "the revived cult Lenin took shape speedily and with careful orchestration." This orchestration was the result of what Cobb and Elder (1972: 79) call "the manipulation of symbols" as a means of rationalizing some action. Fonseca's revival of Sandino's doctrine gave legitimacy to his efforts to instigate revolution against the Somoza regime. The symbol of Sandino not only legitimizes the Sandinista cause but also demonstrates "the ineptness of a major power" (Kearl &

Rinaldi, 1983: 695). In other words, Sandino's success in 1933 became highly relevant in the 1960s and 1970s as it provided hope for toppling the Somoza regime, and hope is essential to gathering support for a revolution. Fonseca skillfully used Sandino to instill hope in the weary Nicaraguan people. For as Anderson (1982: 226) says:

> It is the function of political authority...to give hope. Hope binds society together by the promise of a continuous future and the memory of a common past, allays fears of the unknown by providing connecting links between familiar experience and the terra incognito of what is to come.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

I have argued that the past plays a central role in the creation, maintenance, and success of social movements. In fact, all social movements will reconstruct the past in such a way that it is a past counter to the official past proffered by the dominant group. A reconstruction of charisma may be one element of the process of reconstructing the past as social movement participants may attribute charisma to an historic individual as part of their reconstruction of the past. In addition to a possible reconstruction of a charismatic movement leader, there are other pieces of the past to be reconstructed: historical enemies of the movement, each participant's autobiographical account of becoming a part of the movement, and structural conditions affecting the creation of the movement. Limitation of time and space leaves these questions for future study.

I have used the Nicaraguan revolutionary movement as a case study to focus upon the theoretical issue of the reconstruction of the past. In addition, I have provided the various constructions of history in generally narrative form with only brief analysis so that each "speaker's" story can unfold as they told it in various writings. My conclusions regarding the role of the past in social movements and the phenomenon of posthumous charisma are based upon Sandinista descriptions of the importance of Augusto César Sandino to the revolution won by the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional in 1979. Drawing inference from the writing of Sandino's followers of the 1960s and 1970s, it seems that these followers impute charisma to the man after his death similarly to the imputation of charisma while he was alive. These imputations of charisma to a deceased man are part of a larger past reconstructed to provide meaning to the current revolution

and, thus, to aid in solving the current problem of political, economic, and social oppression in Nicaragua.

Generally, sociologists do not address time and history as social phenomena. As a consequence, there is a theoretical gap to be filled in social movement literature. George Herbert Mead's theory of time accommodates this need. In short, Mead states that as problematic situations arise, individuals and collectivities reconstruct a history for those situations in order to make sense of them and to solve them. The problematic situation for Nicaraguans was the repressive Somoza regime, the extreme poverty of most of the population, and the domination of virtually all aspects of Nicaraguan life by the United States. Consequently, Carlos Fonseca looked to a past which included Sandino and founded the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional as a remedy for Nicaragua's problems.

Social movements theorists have largely failed to explain or to even consider cases such as the rescue of Sandino from near historical oblivion. Movement theories might address Sandino as a symbol, a resource or as part of a narrative. Yet, scholars argue that it is necessary for scholars to place the movement in its historical context. Such an understanding is unquestionably important for the researcher. However, they neglect to consider how movement participants define themselves and their movement historically. Furthermore, social movement scholars do not investigate how movement participants present what they understand their past to be.

The Theory of the Counterpast & the FSLN

Reconstruction of the past among social movement participants makes historical sense of their grievance and of their collective response to it. The counterpast is a history

constructed by social movement participants that explains and elaborates the history of the grievance and that opposes the official, consensual past supported by the dominant group. While at first glance this phenomenon may seem like framing, it is not in that the construction of a frame, as presented by the theorists, is ahistorical. As Polletta (1998) argues, frame analysis does not allow a movement to develop and reshape its story over time. This study argues that neither does it allow movement participants to understand their situation in historical terms and to then build a counterpast. On the other hand, the inclusion of narrative as a focus of social movement theory is welcome and overdue but still is limited in that it is more concerned with stories that largely focus on a movement's own activities and may or may not be based in some sort of evidence. Lastly, framing does not recognize that an emergent event, or several emergent events combined, will set this reconstruction of the past in motion. In summary, framing and narrative are included within the reconstruction of the past.

In the case of the Sandinistas, they clearly identify their grievance as the unacceptable hegemony of the United States over Nicaragua. A feature of that hegemony is US support for the repressive Somoza regime. This abhorrent situation results in a host of social problems such as poverty, illiteracy and disease. It also translates into a great lack of popular participation in Nicaraguan politics and the eternal cycle of Conservative and Liberal elites ousting each other from power with no improvement of the situation of average Nicaraguans. The Sandinistas perceive this grievance to be the same grievance verbalized by Sandino in 1927. Based on Sandino's heroic and successful resistance, the FSLN proposes itself as Sandino's legacy to eliminate US hegemony and Somoza as North America's agent in maintaining domination.

Chapter Seven also discusses how the movement's reconstruction provides clarity for the movement, as mentioned above, but also a sense of continuity and order, ideology and a projected future. Of course, each movement needs a clear message, even if it is a bit complicated. A counterpast is a clear message of why the movement exists and how it came to be. The movement obtains a sense of connectedness to the past thereby providing it with continuity. A counterpast brings a sense of order as the movement participants view one thing as leading to another in such a way that they are ultimately linked in a rather linear chain and looking toward adding another link. That link is a future projected by the movement. However, the projection of the future is likely to be the possibility of two or more futures. There is the future in which the movement is triumphant and the one in which the current grievance or distress continues. Polletta (1998) argues that such ambiguity actually appeals to participants as they wish to discover how the problem is resolved and/or perhaps participate in that resolution.

The Sandinistas reconstructed a history that included four basic components. First, Nicaragua had suffered a long history of foreign intervention, domination and oppression. These problems began with the Spanish but were most vigorously exercised by the United States beginning in the 1850s. Second, there have always been heroic Nicaraguans who have resisted foreign domination, even sacrificing their lives in many cases. The most stunning case of resistance and success was General Augusto César Sandino and his Army in Defense of the National Sovereignty of Nicaragua. Third, the United States withdrew from military occupation of Nicaragua but left in its place a surrogate occupation force in the form of the National Guard under its repressive chief, Anastasio Somoza García. Therefore, Somoza was the puppet of the US although he was

cruel and ruthless in his own right. Fourth, Nicaraguan resistance has only succeeded to a limited degree, but Sandino's example and guidance will be followed by the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional to total victory.

Reconstruction of the past by social movement participants is useful for them. A reconstructed and consensual past provides the movement with historical foundation, purpose, and hope. The Sandinistas latched onto the person of Sandino as one who was fighting such threats just as the FSLN was fighting them. While admitting historical differences, the Sandinistas characterized their struggle as an extension of Sandino's struggle. For example, the FSLN viewed itself as facing the same overwhelming odds faced by Sandino. They also viewed themselves as sharing purpose with Sandino. The purpose of each struggle was to return Nicaragua to Nicaraguans. Therefore, using Sandino as an example, the Sandinistas could understand and present themselves as patriotic Nicaraguans who represented the historical continuation of Sandino's unflagging resolve on this issue. A past which included such stubborn determination brings a message of hope to those who participate directly in the movement and to movement sympathizers. The message is that determination and the consequent sacrifice can only bring victory.

Movements construct a past that stands in opposition to the official history of the dominant group with which the movement is concerned. While Mead's contribution to understanding the processes of reconstructing the past, as briefly discussed above, is enormously helpful in understanding the Sandinista Revolution specifically and social movements generally, it does not address power as it relates to the reconstruction of history. As Touraine argues, the movement struggles over the control of socio-cultural

patterns. Clearly recognizing this point, Sandinista Ricardo Morales Avilés (1981) argues that intellectuals produce culture that pleases the bourgeoisie and serves the bourgeoisie's domination. Chapter Six demonstrates how Somoza constructed a history that legitimized his position and how he and other elites were able to maintain that construction. On the other hand, just like workers and peasants, he says, intellectuals are unprotected from the Somoza regime's power. Morales (1981: 101) then argues that "the struggle for culture cannot be above the revolutionary struggle, not even parallel, it is an integrated part of it, it is one of the fronts of the revolutionary struggle." When Fonseca, Borge, and Mayorga begin their struggle as Sandinistas, they begin not only a struggle for political and economic power but also for the history and culture of the country. Somoza's suppression of all things Sandino has in many ways only served to enhance Sandino's status as a cultural symbol of nationalism and anti-imperialism.

In the struggle over socio-cultural patterns, there must be, at least, two contenders. In this study the principal contenders have been Somoza government, supported by the United States, and the FSLN, a revolutionary social movement. More specifically to this study, the particular pattern under contention is the production of history. The official production of Nicaraguan history is, of course, key to the perceived need to reconstruct history. Beginning with Somoza García, official history was produced by first wresting power from President Sacasa in 1936. Soon after, Somoza could publish his account of Sandino's war and could construct Sandino's image in such a way that Sandino was a bloodthirsty bandit while Somoza himself had saved the country by eliminating the bandit, bringing peace and properly governing Nicaragua. Then Somoza was able to historically eliminate Sandino - or so he thought.

The production of knowledge, which includes official constructions of history, occurs within organizations. The Somozas had the governmental organizations of the nation-state at their disposal to construct a past that legitimated their domination. In the beginning of Somoza García's rise to power, the National Guard was instrumental in producing knowledge about Sandino and his followers. Later, he used media and educational organizations to produce history. The US marines, the US State Department and US media organizations also produced knowledge about the General and his army. The power and resources commanded by these organizations give them the advantage of being able to present this knowledge as truth. To dispute this truth is to confront very powerful entities.

Somoza was able to disseminate his official history through media and education since he largely controlled both. The regime could control operation and content of media through direct ownership, regulation and censorship. It was also to Somoza's advantage that a large percentage of the population was illiterate and, therefore, could not read opposition press like Pedro Joaquín Chamorro's La Prensa. Similarly, Somoza was able to control education by personally editing proposed textbooks, selecting official histories of Nicaragua and controlling school funding. Morales (1981: 95) notes, "...the dominant class prescribes education according to its interests and its educational and social ideals." Morales (1981) continues that since in Nicaragua the dominant class is centered in agricultural export, education contributes to making better agricultural workers, which does not require significant literacy skills nor critical thinking skills. Therefore, according to Morales (1981: 98), this economic domination becomes political

domination “through the oligarchy headed by Somocismo, and a deformation of national life and a backwardness of culture.”

Through controlling the production of history, the dominant group, the Somoza regime, manages ideological socialization. This socialization legitimates the existing socio-cultural patterns and the dominant group’s place in it. Therefore, the Somozas’ control of the state and its agencies, the media and the schools provides this one family with enormous power to shape Nicaraguans’ perceptions of their class and political stratification systems as understandable if not desirable. By maintaining a largely poor and illiterate population, threat to this system is reduced as those groups lack various resources to mount significant resistance. Apparently, exposure to Marxist ideas and Sandino’s struggle convinced a group of university students that this ideological socialization had to be eradicated and replaced.

The social movement participants will construct a counterpast, articulate it, and present it to their members and others as the true history. This construction implies negation of the official history and justification of the Sandinistas’ account of the counterpast. When Fonseca and his co-founders of the FSLN began to study Sandino in the 1950s, thus began the reconstruction of Nicaraguan history and the historical figure of Sandino. What Somoza explained as beneficial and necessary to Nicaragua’s welfare, the FSLN explained as oppressive. Conservatives were not successful in changing the system because, in part, they did not fundamentally disagree with Nicaraguan official history and did not construct a counterpast. US imperialism and domination and Somoza’s role in that domination were unacceptable to the Sandinistas. Countless times in Sandinista writings, the United States and the Somozas are denounced. The National

Guard is commonly called an army of occupation substituting for the US military. According to the Sandinistas, the true story is that Somoza's friendly relationship with the US does not benefit Nicaragua, but actually harms Nicaragua and has for over one hundred years. Furthermore, the FSLN believes that they are clearly the historical answer to this historical problem.

Obviously, a movement's ability to reconstruct history and then to disseminate it is mediated by its access to data regarding a possible counterpast and to communications technology. Through historical research, study circles, word-of-mouth testimony, seizure of radio stations, propaganda and graffiti, the Sandinistas were able to disseminate their reconstruction of the history of US domination and their resistance to it as Sandino's heirs. In fact, given the great degree of control exercised by the Somoza regime over media and education, the Sandinistas did a more than remarkable job of widely presenting their counterpast. Many movements are not likely to withstand the dominant group's response to the counterpast. On the other hand, Somoza's use of repression probably made the Sandinistas an appealing alternative to many. Nevertheless, the FSLN was not simply an alternative to Somoza, they did turn much of the population to view Sandino as, at least, a national hero. At most, many Sandinistas treat him as charismatic. So, in this case, the Sandinista counterpast, their reconstruction of history, includes attributing posthumous charisma to a reconstructed figure. In fact, the concept of posthumous charisma is not only a possible feature of the reconstruction of the past, but it cannot exist without Mead's theory of time.

While the reconstruction of a particular past may be of use to a particular social movement, evidence will support that past, according to Mead's conception. In other

words, the Sandinista past cannot be reduced to a creation, a myth, or a lie. Certainly, they have their own subjective understanding of the past, and/or the evidence may be faulty. Certainly, they have a specific need or emergent event with which to cope. Certainly, they will select some data and reject other data in reconstructing their past. Nevertheless, the FSLN, through the leadership of Fonseca, presents a history of Nicaragua and Sandino based upon documentation. The documents on which Fonseca's version of Sandino were based were produced by Sandino's friends, enemies, and third parties such as journalists. Maines, Sugrue and Katovich argue that social movements are particularly fond of creating mythical pasts in order to gain a power advantage. They contend that "the mythical past does not have a material or objective basis, but it has a material and objective..." (Maines, et al, 1983: 168). They make particular reference to revolutionary groups or groups founded by charismatic leaders. This contention runs counter to Mead's argument and is definitely not the case for the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional.

Just as the Sandinistas reconstruct a past in response to an emergent event, Somoza responds to problematic situations by spreading his present backward. However, the two pasts are quite different. They differ not only in content but as elements of power. While Somoza was in power, his reconstructed past was the official history of Nicaragua presented to Nicaraguan school children and the international news media. In the official past, Sandino was a bandit and a butcher. Among the populace, Sandino's name was a whisper. The stark contrast between Somoza's Sandino and the FSLN's Sandino places the issue of reconstructing a past in bold relief. Mead's theory answers the question of how and why the two pasts can be so different when they are at least

partially based on the same evidence. The theory also implies that neither the official past nor the contending past is objectively correct or incorrect.

Posthumous Charisma

The Sandinistas did not simply discover a man named Sandino. They reconstructed a past around their revolution and made Sandino the focus of that past. Furthermore, they speak of Sandino in terms similar to the manner in which his contemporaries spoke of him. In other words, FSLN members verbally treat Sandino as if he were alive (but never claim that he is physically alive) and as if he were still charismatic. According to Weber, the charismatic leader is a person believed to possess supernatural or exceptional qualities and who answers a call to relieve widespread distress. The reconstruction of an exceptional Sandino did respond to the distress of Nicaraguans.

An element of charisma not fully addressed in this discussion is the reciprocal relationship between the personal qualities of the charismatic person and the attributions made to him/her by followers. Conger (1989) identifies qualities that exist in and/or are attributed to charismatic individuals. The charismatic leader has a unique sensitivity to follower's needs, is able to articulate "an extraordinary vision rather than ordinary goals," is able to build trust in his/her vision among followers and then convince followers that they can achieve the vision. In short, followers, based upon some sort of evidence, perceive the charismatic leader to be someone quite different from themselves in a very positive way and, therefore, superior to themselves in that s/he has the ability to lead them out of the distress. Members of the Army for the Defense of the National

Sovereignty of Nicaragua as well as the Sandinista National Liberation Front speak of Sandino in just that way.

Although the contemporary Sandinistas refer to Sandino and attribute charisma as if he were alive, he is not. Therefore, there is a qualitative difference between charisma and posthumous charisma. Obviously, Carlos Fonseca, Tomás Borge, Humberto Ortega, Sergio Ramírez, Jaime Wheelock, and others had no personal exposure to or personal relationship with Augusto César Sandino. Under these circumstances, the relationship of charismatic leader to followers is distinct. The followers' knowledge is based upon the testimony of intermediaries. For example, Fonseca depended on the works of Somoza García, Salvatierra, Beals and other writers to provide him with a profile of the charismatic Sandino. Similarly, many people depended upon Fonseca to reconstruct Sandino. However, the relationship between contemporary Sandinistas and Sandino generally adheres to the indicators outlined by Weber and others. Posthumous charisma is a variation of charisma as traditionally understood.

The attribution of charisma to a deceased Sandino by living followers proved to be very useful to a revolutionary movement battling overwhelming odds. However, I am not suggesting that the revolution would have failed without Sandino's posthumous charisma. Neither does Weber suggest that movements fail for lack of a charismatic leader. The indication is that movements often benefit greatly from charismatic leadership. While I do not argue that Sandino's charisma totally determined the revolution's outcome, I do contend that reconstruction of the past (which subsumes posthumous charisma) is vital to any success achieved by social movements.

Research Program

Because there is a serious lack of attention by sociologists to the concept of time (especially in the area of social movements), there are numerous opportunities for further research. Comparative studies are necessary to determine the generalizability of how the past is reconstructed by movement participants and, in particular, of the reconstruction of past charisma. In the case of Nicaragua, many questions remain unanswered simply because they are outside the scope of my discussion.

Within the construction of a counterpast, negation will occur, and this study has not examined the process of negation that occurs within the reconstruction of a counterpast. Clearly, in constructing a counterpast, the movement participants will enter into a negation process. In the case of the Sandinistas, they negate US hegemony as well as the Somoza regime. The Sandinistas' reconstruction of the US role in Nicaragua stands in opposition to the reconstruction of General Augusto César Sandino as premier anti-imperialist and leader of their revolution. The negation of the first and devotion to the other creates a helpful dichotomy for the movement and deserves much study.[52]

I have not only discussed the possibility of posthumous imputation of charisma, but also attempted to identify basic conditions for its imputation. Analysis of Sandinista documents yielded four overriding topics of discussion which constitute these conditions. First, Sandinistas devote much attention to Sandino's personal success in expelling the marine occupation force. Second, Sandino's assassination and martyrdom are significantly frequent topics. Third, the return of foreign intervention after Sandino's

[52] For insightful discussion of negation and counter-system analysis, see Sjoberg, et al, 2003.

death is much discussed in Sandinista literature. Fourth, Sandinistas credit Carlos Fonseca with reminding the country of Sandino and his cause.

The question remains concerning the generalizability of the conditions for the attribution of posthumous charisma. Such generalizations are always risky when drawn from a specific case. Charismatic authority is rather rare, and posthumous is surely even more rare. Therefore, instead of claiming universal application, it would be prudent to suggest that similar phenomena be studied comparatively. Several contemporary social movements in Latin America are built upon the ideas of deceased leaders. The Martí National Liberation Front that fought in El Salvador follows the ideas of deceased leader Farabundo Martí (Montgomery, 1982). Numerous peasant movements in Mexico have followed deceased leader of the 1910 Mexican revolution Emiliano Zapata (Bartra, 1985). In Chile, there was a counterrevolutionary movement involving followers of deceased Chilean president Salvador Allende (Chavkin, 1982). Juan and Evita Perón, deceased leaders of Argentina, still have a substantial following in that nation.

Comparative study of the aforementioned movements and others would be useful in answering the question of the generalizability of posthumous charisma and its four conditions. Willner (1984) suggests that it may be that charisma only arises in societies that sanction it through their culture. Further study might include the possible links between attribution of posthumous charisma and cultural phenomena like religion. For example, Roman Catholicism and the veneration of saints may influence the attribution of charisma to a deceased person in Latin America. It would also be interesting to investigate the effects of language on the process. For instance, Spanish can easily

accommodate the transition of “Sandino” to “Sandinista,” but English does not have that capability or, at least, is not often used in that way.

The particular case of the reconstruction of the past by the FSLN needs more attention than I was able to give. Specifically, a study of what has happened to Sandino’s charisma since the revolution was successful and underwent a process of institutionalization would be helpful. According to Weber, charisma wanes with institutionalization and rationalization. An answer to this question requires a thorough review of Sandinista literature written from 1979 to the present. Breaking those years into two time periods would also be useful since the Sandinistas were voted out of power in 1990. Therefore, not only is there a question about Sandino’s role in the revolution after 1979, but there is also a question of how has the Sandinistas’ peaceful opposition status affected Sandino’s charisma.

A parallel research program involves a study of Fonseca. This study has only lightly addressed the meaning of Carlos Fonseca to the Nicaraguan revolution. Sandinistas often name him with Sandino as a leader of the revolution. In her discussion of Castro as a charismatic leader, Willner (1984) mentions that he was able to invoke the figure of José Martí and use Martí as a metaphor. Certainly, Sandino is metaphor for Nicaraguan resistance and victory over the Yankees. Yet why Fonseca was the person to bring Sandino out of the darkness, whether or not Sandino was charismatic while living, and how other Sandinistas viewed Fonseca after death are questions the answers to which will provide more information about the reconstruction of the past in this revolutionary movement. Additionally, it would be useful to study what has happened to the memory of Fonseca since the revolution’s victory in 1979.

Concluding Remarks

In closing, it is evident that the past has played a critical role in the Sandinista revolution of 1979. The historic figure of Augusto César Sandino has occupied a particularly important place in that past. For Sandinistas, the charisma has outlived the man. He promised that it would. Borge (1982: 128) writes:

> [July 1969 and July 1979] fulfill the promise that Sandino made when he said, 'I swear before our homeland and before history that my sword will defend the national honor and that it will mean victory for the oppressed.'
>
> In July 1961, the sword of Sandino was unsheathed, and in July 1979 the promise of victory for the oppressed was kept.

Even Somoza Debayle (1980: 93) recognizes Sandino's posthumous charisma by saying, "The plague of the Sandinistas and the ghost of Sandino have already fallen upon [Nicaragua and] those Central American Republics."

Years after achieving victory, the Sandinistas still present the reconstructed Sandino in meaningful ways. For example, the successful nationwide literacy campaign implemented by the Sandinistas began with Sandino. According to Marin (1984: 9):

> Sandino is revolution. These were the first three words that more than four hundred thousand Nicaraguan peasants and workers learned to spell and write...during the great literacy crusade of 1980.
> The brief phrase was selected not only because it contains the five vowels of the alphabet but fundamentally because it synthesizes the long struggle of the people for their liberty. Augusto César Sandino is the Nicaragua's national hero and to evoke him is to refer to the past, the present and also the future of the popular revolution.

This example may not be surprising because the Sandinistas had won, had power, ran the literacy campaign, and it was so soon after their victory. Yet, now that the Sandinistas are twenty-seven years from their 1979 victory and have been out of power

for fifteen years, they still invoke Sandino. In 2004 the FSLN was denied even a single seat on the new directorate of the Nicaraguan Assembly. There was a belief that the FSLN was shut out resulting from a deal that had been struck between members of the Assembly and the US ambassador. FSLN General Secretary Daniel Ortega likened the agreement that shut out the FSLN to the Tipitapa agreement between Moncada and Stimson that gave the Yankees what they wanted. FSLN deputy General Secretary Tomás Borge then "distributed tiny US flags along with the invitation to the new directorate to use them instead of the Nicaraguan flag itself" (http://www.nicanet.org/archives; 2004). Apparently, Sandino still lives.

APPENDIX

METHODOLOGICAL ESSAY: Finding Nicaragua's Past

In order to begin to understand the Nicaraguan revolutionary movement of the 1960s and 1970s, one must appreciate the interplay of past and present as an integral part of social movements. Specifically, it is important to discover how participants in a social movement shape the past in light of the present reality and then how this past affects the contemporary movement. This question is particularly relevant regarding the efforts of Carlos Fonseca Amador and the contemporary Sandinistas to reach into Nicaragua's history and bring Augusto César Sandino from the 1930s to the 1960s. Fonseca's aim was to use Sandino's thought as a nationalist ideological foundation for revolution-building. However, it seems that Fonseca's goal was not simply to present Sandino as a past national hero and successful revolutionary. His task was also to shape the past according to present reality by "reworking Sandino's thought so that it might become the national vehicle, the carrier of Marxism-Leninism in Nicaragua" (Hodges, 1986: 163). The importance of the rescue and presentation of Sandino's thought from history and obscurity cannot be underestimated as vital ingredients of the Nicarguan revolution.

The research question posed in this study is how did the contemporary Sandinistas - chiefly Carlos Fonseca - reconstruct Nicaragua's past and present a deceased and relatively forgotten Augusto César Sandino to Nicaraguans in order to help drive a revolution? The theoretical and empirical issues focus then on the idea that Fonseca and others spread backward their present of dissatisfaction with the social, political, and economic conditions in Nicaragua. The result was Fonseca's identification

of Sandino as the national ideological father of the contemporary Nicaraguan struggle. Additionally, this study investigates how Fonseca's reconstruction compares to other impressions about Sandino.

The methodological questions which arise from such a research project are legion. To complicate matters further, there are methodological questions to be raised on at least two levels. Due to the nature of the research problem, we can ask the same methodological questions of both the social scientist's and of Fonseca's work. Just a few of the many methodological issues are discussed here.

Level of Analysis

A broad array of theories explaining various facets of social movements and numerous studies of movements focus on macro levels of analysis. A study of the reconstruction of the past among social movement participants requires a micro level of analysis. In Mead's world, it is necessary to view the world from the actor's perspective in order to understand the actor's behavior. Therefore, this study of Sandino and the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional seeks to understand the thinking and claims of General Sandino and those who presented him to a variety of publics. Of course, the study found that the presentation of Sandino and the reconstruction of Nicaragua's history varied across actors as their interpretations of their presents varied.

In order to study how social movement participants define and present a history counter to the official one, the researcher must understand the official history and the process of movement participants' construction of a counterpast. The participants must define their situation and their own interests. Thus far in social movement theory, frame analysis offers the most developed opportunity to allow actors to define their situation

and interests as much social movement theory addresses the movement at the structural level. When using structural analysis, it is the social scientist who places the movement and its participants into history without regard to how movement participants view the past. "In application, structuralist theory nevertheless becomes the omniscient writer-theorist with his or her notions about group and class interests of the historic actors and what decisions and choices they had inevitably to make..." argues Oberschall (1993: 36). He continues, "Structural analysis forces a rigid determinism on historic events, whereas methodological individualism confronts the issue of human agency head-on" (Oberschall, 1993: 36). There are currently innumerable structural analyses of the Sandinista Revolution.

A similar issue arises with regard to the question of relying on subjective meaning created by individuals rather than structural analysis. Kurzman (1997) argues that such methodology calls into question the researcher's place as observer. In addition, "if perceptions can outweigh structures, then protest may not be predictable..." (Kurzman, 1997: 76). Placing the observer status of the social scientist and the chance to establish predictability in jeopardy is a risk that this study takes in order to understand the constructions of Nicaraguan history by the various actors.

This study has relied on the actor's perspective as it is crucial to understanding the reconstruction of history and a counterpast by the Sandinistas. To that end, data presented to understand the histories constructed by Sandino and his followers, the United States, and the Somozas have been presented in a somewhat narrative form with light analysis along the way and more analysis at the ends of chapters and at the end of the work. In that way, the producers of the data are allowed to present their definitions of

the situation in a more raw form than if the data had been presented to provide examples of the analysis. By presenting the data in this manner, the narratives are data in themselves setting the scene for analysis at the end. This type of analysis is not possible from a structural view. Certainly, sociological analysis is the point of this exercise, but it has been a mere thread throughout their historical constructions until all four stories have been presented. Then, more in-depth analysis occurs in the final portions of the study.

Nature of Data

The nature of the data used in the study of the contemporary presentation of a historical figure suggests several methodological issues. The types of documents for the study of Sandino and Fonseca chiefly include biographies, histories, and political propaganda. The propaganda include letters, manifestos, booklets, pamphlets, and periodicals. These different types of data serve different purposes in the research. The propaganda is the vehicle by which the Sandinistas present Sandino to Nicaraguans in the 1960s and 1970s. Biographies of Fonseca and histories of Nicaragua illuminate the process by which Fonseca reconstructed Sandino. Biographies of Sandino, interviews with him, as well as Nicaraguan histories, provide clues about a Sandino perhaps different from Fonseca's Sandino. Sandino's own writings provide further evidence making possible comparison of one view of Sandino with another. The political propaganda published, sold, and distributed by the Sandinistas provides the richest and most obvious data source for discovering that contemporary presentation of Sandino. Propaganda written by Sandino sheds light on Sandino's presentation of self and perhaps his evaluation of himself.

In spite of the obvious usefulness of propaganda to this study, this type of document is rarely used by sociologists and is even ignored in sociology as indicated by its lack of mention in standard texts on research methods. Further, it receives severe criticism from writers such as Gottschalk (1945: 16) who calls it "apologia" and he says, "Propaganda is perhaps the worst example of deliberate perversion of truth out of a desire to benefit a cause" (1945: 40). Such views make questionable assumptions about political propaganda. They assume that there is some sort of consensual truth out there and that propagandists deliberately pervert it. Perhaps writers of propaganda argue in favor of their cause according to their sincere belief in their view of the "facts" surrounding that cause. Interestingly, Gottschalk considers government documents as separate from and more credible than propaganda without quite identifying the difference between the two. Currently, movement scholars studying narrative seem the group most likely to employ propaganda as data.

Political propaganda may not be useful for many research projects, but it serves the purpose here quite nicely. Study of Fonseca's writings and of the other revolutionary leaders yields a composite of their vision of Sandino. It is the subjectivity that is interesting. In the revolutionary propaganda, Sandino is "the most outstanding founding father" (Fonseca, 1981: 26), "the immortal patriot" (Fonseca, 1981: 412), and "the most illustrious son of the Nicaraguan people" (Fonseca, 1980: 13). Infinite description of Sandino in Sandinista propaganda provides rich data regarding the image of a past reconstructed as an extension of a present in revolutionary turmoil.

The biographies and narrative histories provide bases for comparing the Sandino of propaganda to a Sandino described by friends and other witnesses, historians and

social scientists. For example, probably many biographies of Sandino will corroborate many of the details of his life mentioned in propaganda. However, biographies and histories often add details not found in propaganda. For instance, propaganda, biographies, and histories agree on the circumstances of Sandino's birth, but propaganda does not usually mention that Sandino fled Nicaragua as a young man after shooting another (Booth, 1985; Hodges, 1986; Macaulay, 1965). Nor does Sandinista propaganda discuss Sandino's affiliations with freemasonry spiritism, and the Magnetic-Spiritual School as do Hodges (1986; 1992), Navarro-Génie (2002) and Sandino's own writings (1981). Whether these omissions from propaganda were deliberate perversions or not does not diminish the usefulness of each type of document for discovering the various reconstructed Sandinos.

Recognizing the political affiliation of the documents' authors is important in understanding the purpose of the documents and the reconstruction of the particular past contained therein. Documents produced by Sandinistas of any time period will understand different "facts" and reconstruct different pasts than will Somocista writers or writers outside Nicaraguan politics. The difference in the author's group affiliation becomes a methodological problem for the researcher of Sandino when reading biographies and histories. Platt (1981: 55) recognizes that the researcher needs to be aware "of whether some documents should be treated as more important than others." In other words, the researcher cannot necessarily assume that Sandino's biography by Carlos Fonseca (1984) is any more or less important or accurate than El Verdadero Sandino written by Anastasio Somoza García (1936). Neither can s/he automatically assume that the biography written by American journalist Carleton Beals (1932) or New

York Times articles written by Norman Denny are somehow more objective and, therefore, more authoritative than the Sandinista and Somocista accounts. The study of Sandino is again a comparison of presentation, not "truth" contained in that presentation.

In addition to recognizing the group membership of an author, the researcher must realize what importance s/he may grant to a document on the basis of which person authored the document. Rock (1976: 361) writes that documents "are given their fullest meaning when the identity and world of their authors are known..." Conversely, Platt (1981) warns against concentrating on documents which have been highly valued for various reasons including authorship. Admittedly, the researcher of this study is guilty of concentrating on Fonseca above all other contemporary Sandinistas. Of course, the reason for giving such importance to Fonseca is that he seems to be the first of the contemporary Sandinistas to study and write about Sandino in a purposeful and systematic way (Borge, 1980; Hodges, 1986). On the other hand, the comments of Sandinistas other than Fonseca are important to understanding posthumous charisma for charisma is a relationship that includes more than two persons. It may be the duty of the researcher only to recognize an emphasis on a perceived leader rather than to avoid it.

In summary, some of the traditional concerns of researchers relying on documents as data do not apply to this research. Again, the purpose of this research is to determine how Carlos Fonseca spread his present backward to identify and present Sandino to Nicaraguans. Therefore, the use and the subjectivity of political propaganda is not only not a problem, it is desirable. Authorship of the document does not necessarily make one document more credible than another. However, authorship, date, and purpose of the documents are important for purposes of categorizing them as

propaganda, histories, or biographies. Yet, strict attention to traditional prescriptions for understanding "proper" uses of data (e.g. - Gottschalk's recommendations) may be damaging to gaining knowledge. As C. Wright Mills (1959: 120) advises, a particular philosophy of science "is of some use to working social scientists...But its use ought to be of a general nature; no social scientist need take any such model very seriously."

Availability of Data

The third general methodological issue to be addressed concerns the researcher's access to data which will aid in demonstrating the presentation of a past Sandino to contemporary Nicaraguans. Such a study depends heavily upon possibly unavailable data. These data are unusually subject to the whim of the power structure. It also involves data which may never have existed in material form due to widespread illiteracy among the Nicaraguan population.

Acquiring biographies, narrative histories, and political propaganda that have a bearing on the research problem in question becomes extremely difficult when persons in power wish to suppress such data. The researcher's problem is twofold in this case. In Somoza's Nicaragua, Sandinista literature was destroyed and suppressed. After the success of the Sandinista revolution, works critical of Sandino have suffered suppression until recently (Hodges, 1986). Thus, the impressions that Nicaraguans had and have of their past depend largely upon the present power structure in Nicaragua.

Curiously, many methodological discussions do not explicitly recognize suppression of data within a power structure. For example, neither Gottschalk (1945) nor Skocpol (1987) deal effectively with the problem. Dibble (1963) alludes to the lack of treatment of this problem, "...there is always the implicit assumption that documents are

produced by individuals and not by social systems." However, he then launches into a discussion about accessible and existing documents and not about documents hidden, restricted or destroyed due to the nature of the social system. Rock (1976) and Mills (1959) both identify official and unofficial secrecy as problems for gaining data. In Nicaragua, the problem has not been so much one of secrecy but of persons in power trying to rid their social system of, at least, an annoyance, and at most, a threat.

Mills (1959: 158) identifies "the history-making unit [as] the dynamic nation state..." Even though his comments are not directly addressing methodology, Mills recognizes the ability of persons in power, such as Somoza or the Sandinistas, to create an official and "real" past in light of their understanding of the present. If the researcher conforms to the nation-state's idea of history, s/he will not be interested in data suppressed or destroyed by that powerful system. It is probably more likely that the existence of suppressed data potentially useful to a study will not occur to the researcher than it is likely that the researcher will be disinterested. As mentioned previously, Touraine warns of dominant group control of the production of knowledge, which could include production of data.

Another problem in researching a revolutionary movement is the ephemeral nature of much of the data. This problem overlaps with suppression of data because much of the data is deliberately destroyed. However, the point here is one of data lost because it is destroyed by weather, war, or is simply not taken seriously enough for anyone to systematically collect and archive.

Graffiti is an excellent example of data lost to weather, fire, war, building repair or remodeling. Fortunately, one photographic study of Sandinista graffiti exists in

published form, but the photos were taken well after 1979. Nevertheless, this information is helpful because it provides data depicting what type of revolutionary propaganda the average Nicaraguan might have seen daily since Cabezas (1985) argues that *pintas* were very important to the revolution.

Leaflets, pamphlets, flyers or posters are also ephemeral data sources. It is extremely unfortunate that such is the case because, like grafitti, these documents are likely to be the ones most often seen by the populace. However, such documents are relatively easy for their recipients to ignore or discard. They may also be purposefully destroyed by the recipient for fear of repression. A supreme effort such as smuggling it out of the country may be required in order to save such data. Much of this type of data is apparently scattered in individual homes.

A third problem in acquiring the desired documents regarding Sandino is that the Nicaraguan population was largely illiterate prior to the Sandinista victory in 1979 (Ryan et al, 1970). Therefore, either the data were never recorded because the potential creators were illiterate or because the potential readership was illiterate. Furthermore, publication technology is somewhat linked to the literacy rate (Shafer, 1980). If there is a limited amount of potential readership, then there may be little reason to develop production and distribution techniques on a wide scale. Consequently, documents are simply not available due to a lack of production equipment or transportation. Additionally, it has been rather well-documented that the Somozas neglected social needs of Nicaraguans such as literacy and used their ownership of the communications industry to control the populace and make a profit (Ryan et al, 1970). Therefore, the Nicaraguan communications technology was developed only enough to provide service to a small

portion of the Nicaraguan population. Sandinistas certainly did not have liberal and regular access to such Nicaraguan technology inside Nicaragua.

The availability of data required to study the various reconstructions of Sandino is limited by suppression of documents by the reigning power structure, the ephemeral nature of much revolutionary propaganda, and social conditions such as illiteracy and inadequate production techniques. Other problems may inhibit the availability of data, but these three are especially applicable to the Nicaraguan case.

Interpretation of the Data

In the process of data interpretation, researchers interpret data through the filters of their personal and professional values, the context of the data and the research process, the goals of the research and his/her vision of time. The issue of value judgment has warranted countless published discussions. Therefore, it is unnecessary to treat the general topic again here. Yet, as this study considers a culture different from the author's, the role of cultural bias is a factor.

Mills (1959) mentions that the researcher of cultures other than his/her own must make a concerted attempt to gain knowledge regarding the history and cultural nuances of the society under study. Shafer (1980) argues that even though cultural empathy is necessary, the researcher need not abandon his/her own values but simply try to think and believe like his/her subjects. Therefore, understanding Sandino and his value to contemporary Sandinistas requires that the researcher pay special attention to Nicaraguan documents and guarded attention to foreign views of the subject.

Similarly, when reading a document that is data, the researcher must understand the words. The point seems obvious. However, understanding the words in a literal

sense and their real or oblique sense are methodologically important. A simple example of this issue is the phrase "Sandino lives!" written commonly in Sandinista literature. The Sandinistas do not believe that Sandino is physically alive; it is a symbolic statement. However, lacking familiarity with the culture could result in misinterpretation. Shafer (1980: 150) notes, "Sometimes this problem is complicated by language foreign to the reader, or by obsolete or technical terms, odd spelling, a lack of punctuation, or the use of abbreviations." Clearly, the researcher should understand Spanish (and Nicaraguan Spanish) well so that s/he does not have to guess at the literal or real meaning of Sandinista phrases within the context of the documents.

The context of the data within the society is also important and is very similar to a combination of cultural and situational empathy. The researcher must understand that pre-1979 Sandinista political propaganda was produced during a time of insurrection and ultimate violent revolution. It was often produced outside Nicaragua and distributed under threat of violent reprisal by the National Guard.

Similarly, we need to understand the social context of the individual producing the data. Mills (1959: 161) writes, "...we must understand the significance and meaning of the roles [the individual] has played and does play; to understand these roles we must understand the institutions of which they are a part." In Fonseca's case, he was not only the founder of a social movement; he engaged in violent guerrilla activity with the purpose of eliminating the dominant power structure in Nicaragua. Viewing Fonseca's role contextually as a threat to the existing system sheds much light on the meaning of his written works. The researcher must remember such contextual circumstances when

sifting through these documents in order to more fully appreciate their literal and real meanings.

The producer of the research plays a role in a specific context just as writers of documents do. This problem certainly overlaps with that of value judgment. However, it is important to also note, as does Bendix (1984: 7), "that social scientists, as well as their socio-political data, are a part of the historical process." Assumptions that researchers gain control over empirical variation not only make the data ahistorical but also remove the researcher from participation in history. As part of history, the researcher is subject to influence by his/her culture, by institutions, and by the emergent events identified by Mead.

The goals of the researcher influence the interpretation of data as well. For example, searches for cause influence analysis differently than do efforts to describe. Skocpol (1984) identifies three goals of research - developing a grand theory of society, identifying causal relationships, and interpretation through use of concepts. Using research to prove or develop a general theory may lead the researcher to ignore, dismiss or normalize particular or deviant data. Using concepts to interpret history involves special attention to cultural context and requires a topic and arguments that are "culturally or politically 'significant' in the present" (Skocpol, 1985: 368). Focusing on causal regularities identifies specific variables as independent rather than dependent. Therefore, three studies with three different goals regarding the reconstruction of Sandino will result in three distinct interpretations of data. This situation is not necessarily problematic but must be recognized.

The last issue to be treated here with regard to data interpretation is the researcher's concept of time. Perceiving time as a linear progression will affect data analysis differently than if the researcher views time as cyclical. For example, Wallerstein (1982) and Mills (1959) do not envision time as linear, but rather time consists of trends and cycles. Wallerstein believes that only the concept of cyclical history permits proper analysis of long-term, large-scale social change. So Wallerstein's interpretation of data, given his view of time, finds social change to belong to a world system. If he viewed time as linear, he claims that he could not accomplish such macro-analysis because "the drive to perpetual accumulation creates such contradictions that its growth cannot be unremittingly linear and still be capitalist (Wallerstein, 1982: 106).

Bendix (1984) raises another interesting point regarding the methodological problem of time. He says, "By looking at past events from a contemporaneous viewpoint we create a dynamic picture, or by looking backward at the results we create a static picture" (Bendix, 1984: 56). The question for data interpretation becomes whether the contemporary presentation of Sandino is a portion of an ever-changing society or a highly situational, time-bound slice of Nicaraguan history. Mead's theory precludes a static view of history.

Another approach to time is Mead's idea already outlined in this work In this view, individuals live in a present and spread the past backward and the future forward from that present. Interestingly, Gottschalk supports Mead's approach. Gottschalk (1945: 67) writes, "...successive generations reinterpret the past...and rewrite history." Bendix (1984: 9) states it another way, "...man's interest in truth changes, and hence

knowledge of society is not cumulative..." It has already been stated what this view of the nature of the past means for interpreting Sandinista documents.

Conclusion

George Herbert Mead's ideas concerning temporal processes spawn numerous methodological questions as the researcher attempts to link this theory to data. Several of these questions are particularly relevant to the substantive issue of the contemporary Nicaraguan revolution. In studying Carlos Fonseca's attempt to reconstruct a historical Augusto César Sandino for purposes of fueling that revolution, we find that the level of analysis, and the nature, availability and interpretation of the required data are serious considerations for the social scientist. Such a study is dependent upon varied and sometimes unusual data sources, upon suppressed, ephemeral, and non-existent data, and on data interpretation according to the values and goals of the researcher as well as the social context of the data and researcher.

Collecting data to discuss a particular hypothesis or theory is not a simple task. Mills (1959: 125) states, "The problem of empirical verifications is 'how to get down to facts' yet not get overwhelmed by them; how to anchor ideas to facts but not to sink the ideas. The problem is first what to verify and second how to verify it." In this case, the "what" is that Mead's idea of the past as an extension of the present is applicable to Fonseca's rescue of Sandino from history. The "how" is the study of political propaganda, biographies, and narrative histories about Sandino. In particular, the point is to know how the Sandinistas' reconstruction of Sandino in propaganda compares to the other presentations of Sandino, including Somoza's official history of Sandino.

While this essay very briefly discussed a few issues of data such as the level of analysis, and the nature, availability and interpretation of data, it has neglected many other methodological issues. Certainly, they deserve treatment. Nevertheless, in whatever manner the researcher chooses to answer the methodological questions, Mead's theoretical question should not be ignored with regard to social movements including revolution. Hsieh (1975: 87) eloquently summarizes this point, "While historians have the right to choose the viewpoint they consider adequate, it would seem that the omission of the time dimension from the complex process of the Revolution does violence to historical discipline." Fonseca also recognizes the importance of time and linking past and presents. The last paragraph of Sandino: Guerrillero Proletario reads: "in this new battle, the young Nicaraguan generation, faithful to the legacy of Augusto César Sandino, proves with its blood, that he occupies a place of honor" (Fonseca, 1984: 49).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"1,000 Additional Marines Are Ordered to Nicaragua to Quell Sandino Revolt"
1928 New York Times, 4 January 1928: 1.

"1,800 Sandinistas Gather to Give Up"
1933 New York Times, 8 February 1933: 16.

"2,500 Americans Are in Nicaragua"
1931 New York Times, 1 April 1931: 1, 2.

Abbott, Andrew
1983 "Sequences of Social Events: Concepts and Methods for the Analysis of Order in Social Processes." Historical Methods 16: 129-147.

"Accepts Butler's Version"
1929 New York Times, 22 December 1929: 26.

Adams, Frederick Upham.
1914 Conquest of the Tropics. Garden City, New Jersey: Doubleday, Page and Company.

"Admiral Latimer Back"
1927 New York Times, 18 July 1927: 19.

Alemán Bolaños, Gustavo
1932 Sandino! Estudio completo del héroe de Las Segovias. Mexico & Buenos Aires: Imprenta La República.

Alexander, Alfonso
1983 "El semidios (1937)." El Sandinismo: documentos básicos. Ed. Manuel Mejía. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, 204-207.

Alisky, Marvin
1981 Latin American Media: Guidance and Censorship. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.

"American Mine Seized by Nicaraguan Liberals"
1927 New York Times, 2 July 1927: 10, 13.

Anderson, Dwight G.
1982 Abraham Lincoln: The Quest for Immortality. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Apter, David
1968 "Nkrumah, Charisma, and the Coup." Daedulus, 97: 757-792.

Aquino, Enrique
1938 Datos biográficos del Excelentisimo Senor Presidente de la República de Nicaragua, General de División, A. Somoza. Managua: Talleres Nacionales de Imprenta y Encuadernación.

"Arms Cache Found on Sandino 'Farm'"
1934 New York Times, 4 March 1934: 5.

"Army Head Denies Nicaragua Revolt"
1936 New York Times, 30 May 1936: 4.

"Army Rebels Hold Nicaraguan Towns"
1936 New York Times, 29 May 1936: 10.

Arnove, Robert F.
1980 "Values Education: Sociological Perspective." Education and American Culture. Ed. Elizabeth Steiner, Robert Arnove, B. Edward McClellan. New York: Macmillan.

1986 Education and Revolution in Nicaragua. New York: Praeger Publishers.

"Asks Gen. Butler to Explain Speech"
1929 New York Times, 15 December 1929: 1, 22.

Audette, Rose Marie & David Kowalewski
1983 "Nicaragua Debates New Rules for Foreign Companies." The Nicaragua Reader: Documents of a Revolution Under Fire. Ed. by Peter Rosset & John Vandermeer. New York: Grove Press, 306 - 309.

Ayón, Tomás
1956 Historia de Nicaragua desde los tiempos más remotos hasta el ano 1852, Colección Somoza. Madrid:Escuela Profesional de Artes Gráficas.

Baltodano Egner, Charlotte
1977 "Charlotte denuncia torturas." Gaceta Sandinista (Mexico), 21/22, 16,17.

"Bandit is Active Again"
1935 New York Times, 24 July 1935: 8.

Barquero, Sara L.
1946 Guía del Maestro Rural, Publicaciones de la Secretaria de Educación Pública. Managua: Editorial Nuevos Horizontes.

Bart, Pauline B.
1971 "Sexism and Social Science: From the Gilded Cage to the Iron Cage, or, the Perils of Pauline." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33: 734-745.

Bartra, Armando
1985 Los Herederos de Zapata. Mexico City: Ediciones Era.

Beals, Carlton
1928a "With Sandino in Nicaragua I: To the Nicaraguan Border." The Nation, 126: 204, 205.

1928b "With Sandino in Nicaragua II: On the Sandino Front." The Nation 126: 232, 233.

1928c "With Sandino in Nicaragua III: On the Trail of Sandino." The Nation 126: 260, 261.

1928d "With Sandino in Nicaragua IV: Sandino Himself." The Nation 126: 288, 289.

1928e "With Sandino in Nicaragua V: Send the Bill to Mr. Coolidge." The Nation 126: 314-317.

1928f "With Sandino in Nicaragua VI: Sandino - Bandit or Patriot?" The Nation 126: 340, 341.

1928g "This Is War, Gentlemen!" The Nation 126: 404 - 406.

1932 Banana Gold. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company. .

1965 "In Quest of Sandino: Imperialism Still Rides." The Nation, 201: 83-87.

1970 Great Guerrilla Warriors. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

de Belausteguigoitia, Ramón
1934 Con Sandino en Nicaragua. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

"Believe Sandino in Nicaragua"
1930 New York Times, 17 May 1930: 7.

Bendix, Reinhard
1984 Fate, Force, and Freedom: On Historical Sociology. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Benford, Robert D. & Scott A. Hunt
1992 "Dramaturgy and Social Movements: The Social Construction and Communication of Power. " Sociological Inquiry 62: 36-55.

Benjamin, Thomas
2000 La Revolución, Mexico's Great Revolution as Memory, Myth, and History. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Berger, Peter L.
1969 The Sacred Canopy. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.

Bermann, Karl
1986 Under the Big Stick: Nicaragua and the United States Since 1848. Boston: South End Press.

Bertlinger, John
1995 The Best of What We Are: Reflections on the Nicaraguan Revolution. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Blandón, Jesus M.
1981 Entre Sandino y Fonseca. Managua: Departamento de Propoganda y Educación Política del FSLN.

Blumer, Herbert
1937 "Collective Behavior." Principles of Sociology. Ed. by Robert Park. New York: Barnes & Noble.

Booth, John A.
1985 The End and the Beginning: The Nicaraguan Revolution. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Borge, Tomás
no date "Carlos, el amanecer ya no es una tentación." [1976] Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

1980 Nuestros niños lo van a entender. Managua: Secretaría Nacional de Propoganda y Educación Política del FSLN.

1982 "The Second Anniversary of the Sandinista Revolution." Sandinistas Speak. Ed. Bruce Marcus. New York: Pathfinder Press, 127-140.

1984 El axioma de la esperanza. Bilbao, Spain: Editorial Descleé de Brouwer.

1985 "The FSLN and the Nicaraguan Revolution." Nicaragua: The Sandinista People's Revolution. Ed. Bruce Marcus. New York: Pathfinder Press, 106-124.

1986 “Marginal Notes n the Propaganda of the FSLN.” Communicating in Popular Nicaragua. Ed. by Armand Mattelart: 46 - 54.

1990 La paciente impaciencia. Managua: Editorial Vanguardia.

Britton, John A.
1987 Carleton Beals: A Radical Journalist in Latin America. Santa Fe: University of New Mexico Press.

Buell, Raymond Leslie
1930a “States of Central America Progress Toward Demoncracy,” New York Times, 5 October 1930: XX, 3.

1930b “Reconstruction in Nicaragua,” Foreign Policy Reports, 6: 315-343.

1930c “American Supervision of Elections in Nicaragua,” Foreign Policy Reports, 6: 386- 402.

1931 “Our Policy in Latin American as Nicaragua Events Show It,” New York Times, 22 February 1931: IX, 7.

Bureau of Mines
1981 Mineral Industries of Latin America. Washington, DC: Bureau of Mines, US Department of the Interior.

Butler, Smedley
1934 “War Is a Racket,” The Forum, 92:140-143.

1935a “War Is a Racket,” The Reader’s Digest, 26: 111-117.

1935b War Is a Racket. New York: Round Table Press, Inc.

Cabezas, Omar
1985 Fire from the Mountain: The Making of a Sandinista. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.

1986 “The Voice of the People is the Voice of the ‘Pintas.’” Communicating in Popular Nicaragua. Ed. by Armand Mattelart, 37 - 40.

Calderón Ramírez, Salvador
1934 Últimos días de Sandino. Mexico City: Imprenta Mauel León Sánchez.

Calero Díaz, Adolfo
1983 "Nicaraguan Poem (1934)." El Sandinismo: documentos básicos. Ed. Manuel Mejía. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, 226-227.

Calhoun, C.H.
1932 "Would Have Sacasa Agree with Sandino," New York Times, 4 December 1932: IV, 7.

"Calls for Marine Inquiry"
1929 New York Times, 7 December 1929: 3.

Cardenal, Ernesto
1991 "Prologue." Sandino in the Streets. Ed. by Wayne G. Bragg. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Cardenal, Luis G.
1961 Mí rebelión: la dictadura de los Somoza. Mexico DF: Patria y Libertad.

Carrión Cruz, Luis
1980 "Speech to Military School Selim-Shible (1979)." La revolución a través de nuestra dirección nacional. Ed. Secretaría Nacional de Propoganda y Educación Política del FSLN. Managua: Centro de Publicaciones Silvio Mayorga, 53-58.

Carter, C.B.
1927 "The Kentucky Feud in Nicaragua." World's Work, 54: 312 - 321.

Carter, John Franklin
1928 Conquest: America's Painless Imperialism. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Castillo Rivas, Donald
1980 Acumulación de capital y empresas transnacionales en Centroamérica. Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno.

Centro de Investigación y Estudios de la Reforma Agraria (CIERA)
1981 La Mosquitía en la Revolución. Managua: Colección Blas Real Espinales.

Chamorro, Pedro Joaquín
1959 Estirpe Sangrienta: Los Somoza. Buenos Aires: Editorial Triángulo.

Chavkin, Samuel
1982 Storm Over Chile. Westport, Connecticut: Lawrence Hill & Company.

"Chief Praises Marines."
1927 New York Times, 20 July 1927, p. 2.

Clark, Paul Coe
1992 The United States and Somoza, 1933-1956. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Close, David
1999 Nicaragua: The Chamorro Years. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Cobb, Roger W. & Charles D. Elder
1972 "Individual Orientations in the Study of Political Symbolism." Social Science Quarterly 53: 79-90.

Collingwood, R.G.
1946 The Idea of History. London: Oxford University Press.

Conger, Jay
1989 The Charismatic Leader: Behind the Mystique of Exceptional Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Congressional Record - United States Senate
1927 "The Administration's Policy in Latin America," 26 January 1927: 2284-2294.

Conroy, Michael E.
1985 "Economic Legacy and Policies: Performance and Critique." Nicaragua: The First Five Years. Ed. by Thomas W. Walker. New York: Praeger Publishers, 219-244.

"Constructive Era Seen in Nicaragua"
1932 New York Times, 15 November 1932: 4.

Crawley, Eduardo.
1979 Dictators Never Die: A Portrait of Nicaragua and the Somoza Dynasty. London: C. Hurst & Company.

Cronk, George
1987 The Philosophical Anthropology of George Herbert Mead. New York: Peter Lang.

"Date Fixed for Ending Nicaraguan Army Aid"
1932 New York Times, 7 April 1932: 26.

Davies, James Chowning
1979 "The J-Curve of Rising and Declining Satisfactions as a Cause of Revolution and Rebellion. "Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives. Ed. by Hugh Davis Graham & Ted Robert Gurr. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Davis, Joseph E.
2002 "Narrative and Social Movements: the Power of Stories." Stories of Change: Narrative and Social Movements. Ed. by Joseph E. Davis. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Deambrosis Martins, Carlos
1983 "Magazine Article (1928)." El Sandinismo: documentos básicos. Ed. Manuel Mejía. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, 221-222.

"Defeated Sandino Once Mexican Rebel"
1927 New York Times, 21 July 1927, p. 5.

Degler, Carl W.
1975 Is There a History of Women? New York: Oxford University Press.

Denny, Harold Norman
1928a "Sandino Reported Killed in Bombing by Marine Planes," New York Times, 19 January 1928: 1, 3.

1928b "Marines Suspect Ruse by Sandino," New York Times, 20 January 1928: 1, 4.

1928c "Sandino's Revolt Believed Crushed," New York Times, 24 January 1928: 3.

1928d "Thousands Flee Before Sandino," New York Times, 8 February 1928: 1, 9.

1928e "Sandino is Pressed by Marine Patrols," New York Times 11 February 1928: 2.

1928f "Marine Planes Fail to Locate Sandino," New York Times, 12 February 1928: 2.

1928g "A 'Bamboo War' Under the Tropic Sun," New York Times, 26 February 1928: V.4.

1928h "Wipe Out Sandino, Gen Feland Orders," New York Times, 15 March 1928: 9

1928i "Marines Uncover Sandino Fortress," New York Times, 20 April 1928: 24.

1928j "Reports Marshall Slain in Nicaragua," New York Times, 25 April 1928: 1, 8.

1928k "Sandino in Letter Warns Americans," New York Times, 18 May 1928: 4.

1928l "Nicaragua Resumes Elections Debate," New York Times, 5 March 1928: 2.

1928m "Decrees Nicaragua Shall Vote Under Us," New York Times, 22 March 1928: 2.

1928n "Our Marines Must Guard Nicaraguans," New York Times, 1 June 1928: 27.

1928o "Wall Street Role Large in Nicaragua," New York Times, 29 July 1928: II.10.

1929 "A New Era of Peace Opens in Nicaragua," New York Times, 4 August 1929: IX, 1.

1929 Dollars for Bullets. New York: The Dial Press.

1931 "American Concerns Menaced by Rebels," New York Times, 18 April 1931: 12.

"Denny, Harold Norman"
1948 The National Cyclopaedia, Volume 34. New York: James T. White & Company; 300, 301.

"Despite New Clash Marines Will Leave Nicaragua by June"
1931 New York Times, 17 April 1931: 1, 18.

Diederich, Bernard
1989 Somoza and the Legacy of US Involvement in Central America. Maplewood, NJ: Waterfront Press.

Discursos Oficiales Pronunciados, en las Honras Funebres del Excelentisimo Señor General 1956 Don Anastasio Somoza, Presidente de Nicaragua. Managua: Publicaciones del Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores.

"Discusses Nicaragua Loan"
1928 New York Times, 25 May 1928: 35.

Documentos para la historia de Nicaragua.
1954 Colección Somoza. Madrid: Viuda de Galo Sáez.

Doob, Leonard W.
1983 Personality, Power, and Authority. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

"Eisenhower Expresses Regret Over Somoza"
1956 New York Times, 30 September 1956: 3.

El Estudiante
1970 El Estudiante (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Nicaragua), No 1, 22 July 1970.

1974 El Estudiante (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Nicaragua), No 3, 1974.

1975 El Estudiante (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Nicaragua), No 5, May 1975.

1976 El Estudiante (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Nicaragua), No 8 August 1976.

El Sandinista
1975 El Sandinista: Órgano del Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional, August/September 1975.

Escobar, Juan Benito
1978 “Editorial.” Trinchera: Órgano oficial del Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional, August 1978, 2, 11.

1980 Ideario Sandinista. Ed. by Fernando Carmona. Mexico DF: Editorial Nuestro Tiempo.

Estrada, Francisco
1983 "Personal Correspondence (1933)." El Sandinismo: documentos básicos. Ed. Manuel Mejía. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, 171.

Fabela, Isidro
1983 "Personal Correspondence (1933)." El Sandinismo: documentos básicos. Ed. Manuel Mejía. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, 221, 222.

Fen, Sing-Nan
1951 "Present and Re-presentation: A Discussion of Mead's Philosophy of the Present." The Philosophical Review 60: 545-550.

Ferrell, Robert H.
1963 The American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy, Volume XI. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc.

Fireman, Bruce & William A. Gamson
1988 "Utilitarian Logic in the Resource Mobilization Perspective." The Dynamics of Social Movements: Resource Mobilization, Social Control, and Tactics. Ed.by Mayer N. Zald & John D. McCarthy. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, pp.8-44.

Fonseca Amador, Carlos
1980 "Por la Lucha Armada, a la Hermandad Internacionalista (1970)." Nicaragua: La Estratégia de la Victoria. Ed. Fernando Carmona. Mexico City: Editorial Nuestro Tiempo, 165-167.

1981 Obras: Bajo la bandera del sandinismo. Ed. Agustín Alonso. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

1982 "Cronología de la resistencia sandinista." Obras: Viva Sandino. Ed. Agustín Alonso. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, 89-167.

1983 "Imperialismo-antimperialismo." El Sandinismo: documentos básicos. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, 257-260.

1983 "Sandinismo." El Sandinismo: documentos básicos. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, 261-263.

1984a Sandino: Guerrillero Proletario (1972). Managua: Secretaría Nacional de Propaganda y Educación Política del FSLN.

1984b Viva Sandino (1976). Managua: Departamento de Propaganda y Educación Política del FSLN.

Foucault, Michel
1977 Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews. Ed. by Donald F. Bouchard. Trans. by Donald F. Bouchard & Sherry Simon. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional
1982 "The Historic Program of the FSLN" (1969). Sandinistas Speak. Ed. by Bruce Marcus. New York: Pathfinder Press.

Gaceta Sandinista
1976a "Introduction." Gaceta Sandinista (Honduras), 1,2.

1976b "Inglaterra cierra su embajada." Gaceta Sandinista (Cuba), 12, 20-23.

1978 "Héroes Sandinistas." Gaceta Sandinista (Cuba), 21, 22.

Gámez, José D.
1889 Historia de Nicaragua. Madrid:

Gamson, William A.
1975 The Strategy of Social Protest. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.

1988 "Political Discourse and Collective Action." International Social Movement Research, Vol. 1. Ed. by Bert Klandermans, Hanspeter Kriesi, & Sidney Tarrow. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 53-76.

1995 "Constructing Social Protest." Social Movements and Culture. Ed. by Hank Johnston & Bert Klandermans. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

2004 "Bystanders, Public Opinion and the Media." The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements. Ed. by David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, & Hanspeter Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publising.

Gamson, William A., Bruce Fireman, & Steven Rytina
1982 Encounters with Unjust Authority. Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press.

García Marquez, Gabriel
1979 Los Sandinistas. Bogotá: Editorial la Oveja Negra.

"Gen. Feland Returns from Nicaragua Duty"
1929 New York Times, 8 April 1929: 27.

"General Lejeune Predicts Nicaraguan Peace Soon
1928 New York Times, 19 February 1928: 22.

Gibb, George Sweet & Evelyn H. Knowlton
1976 History of Standard Oil Company: The Resurgent Years, 1911-1927. New York: Arno Press.

Gilbert, Gregorio Urbano
1983 "Apuntes anecdóticos del libertador." El Sandinismo: documentos básicos. Ed. Manuel Mejía. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, 193-203.

Gonzalez Casanova, Pablo
1985 El poder al pueblo. Mexico City: Eidciones Océano.

Goode, William H.
1978 The Celebration of Heroes. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Gottschalk, Louis, Clyde Kluckholn & Robert Angell
1945 The Use of Personal Documents in Sociology, Anthropology, and History. New York: Social Science Research Council.

"Guardsmen to Die in Sandino Slaying"
1934 New York Times, 24 February 1934: 3.

Habermas, Jürgen
1970 Toward a Rational Society: Student Protest , Science, and Politics. Trans. by Jeremy J. Shapiro. Boston: Beacon Press.

1973 Legitimation Crisis. Trans. by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.

"Harold Denny, 56, Journalist, Dead"
1945 New York Times, 4 July 1945: 13.

Hatfield, G.D.
1927/1990 "Hatfield's Circular." Sandino: The Testimony of a Nicaraguan patriot, 1921-1934. Ed. & Trans. by Robert Edgar Conrad: 78.

Hernández Maradiaga, Manuel
1986 Ahora sé que Sandino manda. Ed. Javier Díaz Torrez. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, 296, 297.

Heyck, Denis Lynn Daly
1990 Life Stories of the Nicaraguan Revolution. New York: Routledge.

Hodges, Donald
1986 Intellectual Foundations of the Nicaraguan Revolution. Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press.

1992 Sandino's Communism. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Hodgson, Godfrey
1990 The Colonel. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Homenaje Nacional al patriarca del liberalismo, Dr. Crisanto Sacasa.
1965 Managua: Editorial San Enrique.

"Hoover Denounces Sandino as Outlaw; Expects Capture"
1931 New York Times, 22 April 1931: 1, 20.

Hsieh, Winston
1975 Chinese Historiography on the Revolution of 1911. Stanfor, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

"Hunger Emboldens Nicaragua Bandits"
1929 New York Times, 29 January 1929: 20.

Hunt, Scott A. & Robert D. Benford
2004 "Collective Identity, Solidarity, and Commitment." The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements. Ed. by David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, & Hanspeter Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Hunt, Scott A, Robert D. Benford, & David A. Snow
1994 "Identity Fields: Framing Processes and the Social Construction of Movement Identities." New Social Movements. Ed. by Enrique Laraña, Hank Johnston, & Joseph R. Gusfield. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 185-208.

Ibarra Grijalva, Domingo
1973 The Last Night of General Augusto C. Sandino. New York: Vantage Press.

Instituto de Estudio del Sandinismo (IES)
1982 La insurrección popular en Masaya. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

1985a El sandinismo: documentos básicos. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

1985b Carlos: El eslabón vital. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

1986 Ahora sé que Sandino manda. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

"Investigate Story Sandino Took Bribe"
1929 New York Times, 26 December 1929: 12.

"Issues Book on Sandino"
1936 New York Times, 28 September 1936: 5.

Jarquín C., Edmundo & Pablo Emilio Barreto
1983 "A Dictatorship 'Made in the USA.'" The Nicaragua Reader: Documents of a Revolution under Fire. Ed. by Peter Rosset & John Vandermeer. New York: Grover Press, Inc.

Jenkins, J. Craig & Chrles Perrow
1997 "Insurgency of the Powerless: Farm Worker Movements (1946 - 1972)" Social Movements: Readings on Their Emergence, Mobilization, and Dynamics. Ed. by Doug McAdam & David A. Snow. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Joas, Hans
1980 G.H. Mead: A Contemporary Re-examination of His Thought. Trans. Raymond Meyer. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Jung, Harald
1983 "Behind the Nicaraguan Revolution." Revolution in Central America. Ed. The Stanford Central America Action Network. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 21- 36.

Kamman,William.
1968 A Search for Stability: United States Diplomacy toward Nicaragua, 1925-1933. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Karnes, Thomas L.
1978 Tropical Enterprise: The Standard Fruit and Steamship Company in Latin America. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Katovich, Michael A. & Carl J. Couch
1992 "The Nature of Social Pasts and Their Use as Foundations for Situated Action." Symbolic Interaction 15: 25-47.

Katz, Jack
1972 "Deviance, Charisma, and Rule-Defined Behavior." Social Problems 20: 186-201.

Kearl, Michael C. & Anoel Rinaldi
1983 "The Political Uses of the Dead as Symbols in Contemporary Civil Religions." Social Forces 61: 693-708.

"Kellogg Justifies Defense"
1927 New York Times, 19 July 1927: 10

Kennedy, Paul P.
1956 "Gen. Somoza is Dead at 60, Victim of Assassin's Bullets." New York Times, 30 September 1956: 3.

Kepner, Charles David
1967 Social Aspects of the Banana Industry. New York: AMS Press, Inc.

"'Kill All Americans,' Nicaraguans Are Told"
1928 New York Times, 5 april 1928: 3.

"Killers of Sandino Get Amnesty as Benefactors"
1934 New York Times, 25 August 1934: 5.

Kimmel, Michael
1989 "'New Prophets' and 'Old Ideals': Charisma and Tradition in the Iranian Revolution." Social Compass 36: 493-510.

Kinzer, Stephen
1991 Blood of Brothers: Life and War in Nicaragua. New York: GP Putnam's Sons.

Knox, Philander Chase
1913 Speeches Incident to the Visit of Philander Chase Knox to the Countries of the Caribbean. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Kouwenhoven, John A.
1968 Partners in Banking: An Historical Portrait of a Great Private Bank. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.

Kraft, Richard J.
1983 "Nicaragua: Educational Opportunity under Pre- and Post-Revolutionary Conditions." Politics and Education. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 79-103.

Kurzman, Charles
1997 "Structural Opportunity and Perceived Opportunity in Social-Movement Theory: The Iranian Revolution of 1979." Social Movements: Readings on Their Emergence, Mobilization, and Dynamics. Ed. by Doug McAdam & David A. Snow. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Labrousse, Alain
1971 Los Tupamaros: guerrilla urbana en el Uruguay. Buenos Aires: Editorial Tiempo Contemporaneo.

LaFeber, Walter
1984 Inevitable Revolutions: The United in Central America. New York W.W. Norton & Company.

Lake, Anthony.
1989 Somoza Falling. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Lapple-Wagenhals, Doris
1984 A New Development Model, a New Communication Policy?: on communication in Nicaragua before and after July 19,1979. New York: P. Lang.

"Last of Marines Leave Nicaragua"
1933 New York Times, 3 January 1933: 3.

"Leader of Lost Causes"
1934 New York Times, 23 February 1934: 4.

LeBon, Gustave
1982 The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind (1895). Marietta, GA: Larlin.

Lerner, Gerda
1976 "The Female Majority Finds Its Past." Current History, 70: 193-196, 231-232.

Lee, Harold N.
1963 "Mead's Doctrine of the Past." Tulane Studies in Philosophy 12: 52-75.

Lewis, J. David & Andrew J. Weigert
1981 "The Structures and Meanings of Social Time." Social Forces 60: 432-462.

Lifton, Robert Jay
1967 Boundaries. New York: Random House.

1968 Revolutionary Immortality. New York: Random House.

Lindholm, Charles
1990 Charisma. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.

López, Santos
no date Memorias del Coronel Santos López. Managua: Secretaría Nacional de Propoganda y Educación Política.

Lowenthal, David
1985 The Past is a Foreign Country. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lozano, Lucrecia
1985 De Sandino al triunfo de la revolución. Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.

Macaulay, Neill
1985 The Sandino Affair. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Madsen, Douglas & Peter G. Snow
1991 The Charismatic Bond: Political Behavior in Time of Crisis. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Maines, David R., Noreen M. Sugrue, & Michael A. Katovich
1983 "The Sociological Import of G.H. Mead's Theory of the Past." American Sociological Review 48: 161-173.

"Man Named as Killer of Sandino Released"
1934 New York Times, 4 April 1934: 44.

"Managua is Tense in an Armed Truce"
1936 New York Times, 2 June 1936: 11.

"Marines Hunted Sandino 5 Years"
1934 New York Times, 23 February 1934: 4.

"Managua is Destroyed, 1,100 Reported Killed"
1931 New York Times, 1 April 1931: 1, 2.

Maraboto, Emigidio E.
1980 Sandino ante el coloso: Un atentado internacional de los Estados Unidos (1929). Managua: Ediciones Patria y Libertad.

Managua: Ediciones Pátria y Libertad. "Marines Proclaim Nicaragua Success"
1929 New York Times, 1 January 1929: 7.

Marín, Jaime
1984 La Revolución Sandinista. Buenos Aires: Editorial Anteo.

"Marines Proclaim Nicaragua Success"
1929 New York Times, 1 January 1929: 7.

"Marines Repulse Nicaragua Rebels, Kill 50"
1927 New York Times, 18 July 1927: 1.

"Marines to Fight Nicaragua Bandits"
1929 New York Times, 17 January 1929: 2

"Marines to Reduce Nicaraguan Duties"
1931 New York Times, 7 February 1931: 8.

"Marines Will Quit Nicaragua in 1932"
1931 New York Times, 14 February 1931: 1, 3.

Marx, Gary T. & Douglas McAdam
1994 Collective Behavior and Social Movements: Process and Structure. New York: Prentice Hall.

Marx, Karl
1986 Karl Marx: A Reader. Ed. by Jon Elster. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maxfield, Sylvia & Richard Stahler-Shold
1985 "External Constraints." Nicaragua: The First Five Years. Ed. by Thomas Walker. New York: Praeger, 245 - 264.

"May End Butler Incident"
1929 New York Times, 18 December 1929: 24.

May, Stacy & Galo Plaza
1976 The United Fruit Company in Latin America. New York: Arno Press.

McAdam, Doug
1982 Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

1994 "Culture and Social Movements." New Social Movements. Ed. by Enrique Laraña, Hank Johnston & Joseph R. Gusfield. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 36- 57.

McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy & Mayer Zald
1988 "Social Movements." Handbook of Sociology. Ed. by Neil J. Smelser. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 695-737.

McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow & Charles Tilly
2001 Dynamics of Contention. New York: Cambridge University Press.

1996 "Introduction: Opportunities, mobilizing structures, and framing processes - toward a synthetic, comparative perspective on social movements." Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings. Ed. by Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald. New York: Cambridge University Press. 1-20.

McCann, Thomas P.
1976 An American Company: The Tragedy of United Fruit. Ed. by Henry Scammell. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.

McCarthy, John D. & Mayer Zald
1977 "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." American Journal of Sociology 82: 1212-1241.

Mead, George Herbert
1934 Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

1936 Movements of Thought in the Nineteenth Century. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

1938 The Philosophy of the Act. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

1959 The Philosophy of the Present. La Salle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing Company.

1964 Selected Writings. Ed. Andrew J. Reck. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Mendieta Alfaro, Roger
1979 El último marine. Managua: Editorial Unión.

Merrill, John C., R. Bryan & Marvin Alisky
1964 The Foreign Press: A Survey of the World's Journalism. Baton Rouge: Lousiana State University.

1970 The Foreign Press: A Survey of the World's Journalism. Baton Rouge: Lousiana State University.

"Mexico to Deport Sandino"
1929 New York Times, 9 August 1929: 5.

Meyer, Harvey K.
1972 Historical Dictionary of Nicaragua. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Miller, David L.
1943 "G.H. Mead's Conception of 'Present'." Philosophy of Science 10: 40-46.

1973 George Herbert Mead: Self, Language, and the World. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Miller, Valerie
1982 "The Nicaraguan Literacy Crusade." Nicaragua in Revolution. Ed. Thomas W. Walker. New York: Praeger, 241-258.

Millet, Richard
1966 The History of the Guardia Nacional de Nicaragua, 1925-1965. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, Inc.

Mills, C. Wright
1959 The Sociological Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ministerio de Educación Pública
1952 Plan de estudios y programas respectivas para las escuelas rurales de Nicaragua. Managua: Talleres Gráficos San Antonio.

Miyahara, Kojiro
1983 "Charisma: From Weber to Contemporary Sociology." Sociological Inquiry 53: 368-388.

"Moncada Approved in Nicaraguan Race"
1927 New York Times, 26 October 1927: 8.

"Moncada Rejects Stimson Peace Plan"
1927 New York Times, 5 May 1927: 16

"Moncada Rejoices Over Sandino Death"
1934 New York Times, 23 June 1934: 4.

"Moncada to Renew Election Aid Plea"
1929 New York Times, 7 April 1929: 6.

Montgomery, Tommy Sue
1982 Revolution in El Salvador. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Morales Avilés, Ricardo
1980 La dominación imperialista en Nicaragua. Managua: Secretaría Nacional de Propaganda y Educación Política del FSLN.

1981 Obras: No pararemos de andar jamás. Ed by Instituto de Estudio del Sandinismo. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

Morris, Aldon D.
1984 The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement. New York: The Free Press. Nalty, Bernard C.

Nalty, Bernard C.
1962 "The United States Marines in Nicaragua." Marine Corps Historical Reference Series, Number 21. Washington, DC: US Marine Corps.

Natanson, Maurice
1953 "G.H. Mead's Metaphysic of Time." The Journal of Philosophy 50: 770-782.

"Natives Take Over Nicaraguan Guard"
1932 New York Times, 17 December 1932: 7.

Navarro-Genie, Marco Aurelio
2002 Augusto "César" Sandino: Messiah of Light and Truth. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Navasky, Victor
1990 "Afterword." The Nation, 1865-1990. Ed. by Katherine Vanden Heuvel. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press.

Nearing, Scott & Joseph Freeman
1925 Dollar Diplomacy: a Study in American Imperialism. New York: BW Huebsch & the Viking Press.

http://www.nicanet.org/archives
2004 "FSLN Shut Out of National Assembly Leadership." 12 January 2004.

"Nicaragua Concedes Victory for Sacasa"
1932 New York Times, 8 November 1932: 25.

"Nicaragua Discusses Loan"
1927 New York Times, 11 November 1927: 35

"Nicaragua Favors Marine Withdrawal"
1931 New York Times, 18 February 1931: 8.

"Nicaragua Fighting Rouses Congress to Attack Policy"
1928 New York Times, 5 January 1928: 1, 2.

"Nicaragua Had Gain in Customs Funds"
1928 New York Times, 10 June 1928: III, 6.

"Nicaragua Picks Somoza"
1936 New York Times, 9 December 1936: 18.

"Nicaragua Rebel Defiant"
1927 New York Times, 17 July 1927: II, 1.

"Nicaragua Rebel Defies Ultimatum"
1927 New York Times, 16 July 1927: 28.

"Nicaragua Rebels Give Up, Charging War Threat by Us"
1927 New York Times, 6 May 1927: 1, 2.

"Nicaragua Revolt Declared at End"
1927 New York Times, 14 May 1927: 4.

"Nicaragua Unstirred by Return of Sandino"
1930 New York Times, 18 May 1930: 15.

"Nicaraguan Army Rules More Towns"
1936 New York Times, 31 May 1936: 31.

"Nicaraguan Battle Raged for 17 Hours"
1927 New York Times, 19 July 1927: 1.

"Nicaraguan Fort Falls to Rebels"
1936 New York Times, 3 June 1936: 11.

"Nicaraguan Guard Balked in Battle to Seize Palace"
1936 New York Times, 1 June 1936: 6.

"Nicaraguan Guard Blamed for Killing"
1934 New York Times, 25 February 1934: 22.

"Nicaraguan Guard Model Little Army"
1932 New York Times, 29 March 1932: III, 8.

"Nicaraguan Loan in View"
1927 New York Times, 10 November 1927: 35.

"Nicaraguan Planters Quit"
1932 New York Times, 13 September 1932: 37.

"Nicaraguan Rebel Defiant"
1927 New York Times, 17 July 1927: II, 1.

"Nicaraguan Rebel Defies Ultimatum"
1927 New York Times, 16 July 1927: 28.

"Nicaraguans Choose Somoza for Office"
1936 New York Times, 16 June 1936: 17.

"Nicaraguans Plan Anti-Outlaw Force"
1929 New York Times, 9 January 1929: 6.

"Nicaragua's Election"
1932 New York Times, 9 November 1932: 18.

Nichols, John Spicer
1982 "The News Media in the Revolution," Nicaragua in Revolution. Ed. by Thomas W. Walker. New York: Praeger, 181-199.

Noonan, Rita
1997 "Women Against the State: Political Opportunities and Collective Action Frames in Chile's Transition to Democracy," Social Movements: Readings on Their Emergence, Mobilization, and Dynamics. Ed. by Doug McAdam & David A. Snow. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.

"Nye, Here, Assails Force in Nicaragua"
1928 New York Times, 29 January 1928: 2.

Oberschall, Anthony
1993 Social Movements: Ideologies, Interests, and Identities. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Ortega Saavedra, Daniel
1983 El acero de guerra o el olivo de paz. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

Ortega Saavedra, Humberto
1979 FSLN: 50 años de lucha sandinista (1976). Medellín, Colombia: Ediciones Hombre Nuevo.

1980 "Speech Made in Gruta Javier (1979). "La revolución a través de nuestra dirección nacional. Ed. Secretaría Nacional de Propoganda y Educación Política. Managua: Centro de Publicaciones Silvio Mayorga, 9-13.

Oulahan, Richard V.
1927 “Threat Confirmed Against Nicaragua; Opens New Policy,” New York Times, 8 May 1927: 1, 21.

1931 “Washington Withdraws Its Protection from Americans in Central Nicaragua; Citizens of Other Countries Affected” New York Times, 18 April 1931: 1, 12.

“Our Investments Put at $13,000,000”
1931 New York Times, 1 April 1931: 3.

“Our Policy in Nicaragua”
1931 New York Times, 3 January 1931: 16.

“Owners Say Mine is Wreck”
1928 New York Times, 4 May 1928: 2.

de Paredes, José
1983 "Interview (1928).” El Sandinismo: documentos básicos. Ed. Manuel Mejía. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, 221.

Pavletich, Estéban
1983 "Aún Llevamos Plumas." El Sandinismo: documentos básicos. Ed. Manuel Mejía. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, 192.

“Peace in Nicaragua Seen as Permanent”
1929 New York Times, 8 September 1929: II, 2.

Pearce, Jenny
1983 "The Eagle Rises." The Nicaragua Reader. Ed. by Peter Rosset & John Vandermeer. New York: Grove Press, Inc.
Pérez-Valle, Eduardo
1980 El martirio del héroe: La Muerte de Sandino. Managua: Biblioteca del Banco Central de Nicaragua.

Pierre-Charles, Gerard
1977 "En el L aniversario del inicio de la Guerra de Liberación Nacional." Gaceta Sandinista (Mexico), 15/16: 4-7.

Phelps, Clyde
1927 The Foreign Expansion of American Banks. New York: Ronald Press Company.

“Plan Construction in North Nicaragua”
1929 New York Times, 21 February 1929: 11.

Platt, Gerald M. & Stephen J. Lilley
1994 Self, Collective Behavior and Society: Essays Honoring the Contributions of Ralph H. Turner. Ed. by Gerald M. Platt & Chad Gordon. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc.

Polletta, Francesca
1998 "'It Was Like a Fever...' Narrative and Identity in Social Protest." Social Problems 45: 137-159.

2002 "Plotting Protest: Mobilizing Stories in the 1960 Student Sit-Ins." Stories of Change: Narrative and Social Movements. Ed. by Joseph E. Davis. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press

Pomares Ordóñez, Germán
1989 El Danto, algunas correrías andanzas. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

Quintana Orozco, Osman
1968 Apuntes de Historia de Nicaragua. Managua: Editora Mundial.

"Raiders Dynamite Mines in Nicaragua"
1928 New York Times, 3 May 1928,: 2.

Ramírez, Sergio
1981 "Sandino: clase e ideología." Augusto C. Sandino, El pensamiento vivo. Ed. by Sergio Ramírez. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, 423-441.

1988 El muchacho de Niquinohomo. Managua: Editorial Vanguardia.

1989 La marca del Zorro, hazañas del comandante Frainciso Rivera Quintero contadas a Sergio Ramírez. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

Rand, Lenox H. & Edward B. Sturgess
1931 The Mines Handbook - Part II. Suffern, New York: Mines Information Bureau, Inc.

"Rebellion Spreads in North Nicaragua"
1927 New York Times, 22 October 1927: 3.

"Recall of Marines in Nicaragua Urged"
1931 New York Times, 3 January 1931: 5.

"Receiver Restored for Oil in Mexico"
1927 New York Times, 23 July 1927: 21.

"Reseña histórica de la vida de Sandino." Introducción al Pensamiento de Sandino. Managua: Editorial Juan de Dios Munoz.

“Revolt is Predicted”
1934 New York Times, 23 February 1934: 4.

Rice, John Steadman
2002 “‘Getting Our Histories Straight’: Culture, Narrative and Self-Identity in the Self-Help Movement.” Stories of Change: Narrative and Social Movements. Ed. by Joseph E. Davis. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press

Rienstra, M. Howard
1984 "History, Objectivity, and the Christian Scholar." History and Historical Understanding. Ed. C.T. McIntire & Ronald A. Wells. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdsmans Publishing Company.

Rinehart, James F.
1997 Revolution and the Millenium: China, Mexico and Iran. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Rius
1982 Nicaragua for Beginners. New York: Writers and Readers Publishing, Inc.

Roche, John P. & Stephen Sachs
1965 "The Bureaucrat and the Enthusiast: An Exploration of the Leadership of Social Movements." The Western Political Quarterly 8: 248-261.

Román, José
1979 Maldito Pais. Managua: El pez y la serpiente. (1933)

Roth, Guenther
1975 "Socio-Historical Model and Developmental Theory: Charismatic Community, Charisma of Reason and the Counterculture." American Sociological Review 40: 148-157.

Rothschuh Villanueva, Guillermo
1986 “Notes on the History of Revolutionary Journalism in Nicaragua.” Communicating in Popular Nicaragua. Ed. by Armand Mattelart: 28 - 36.

Rudolph, James D. (ed.)
1982 Nicaragua: A Country Study. Area Handbook Series. Washington. DC: Department of the Army.

Ryan, John Morris, Robert N. Anderson, Harry R. Bradley, Carl E. Negus, Robert B. Johnson, Charles W. Hanks, Gerald F. Croteau, Cathy C. Council
1970 Area Handbook for Nicaragua. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Sacasa, Juan Bautista
1936 Cómo y porqué caí del poder. Managua: Editorial Vanguardia. (1936)

“Sacasa Betrayed, He Says in Exile”
1936 New York Times, 10 June 1936: 8.

“Sacasa Directs Guard”
1934 New York Times, 3 March 1934: 3.

“Sacasa is Declared in Danger of Death”
1934 New York Times, 23 February 1934: 4.

Salazar Valiente, Mario
1975 "Ponencia en el aniversario del asesinato de Augusto César Sandino." Gaceta Sandinista (Mexico), 3: 18-20.

“Salvador is Indignant”
1934 New York Times, 23 February 1934: 4.

Salvatierra, Sofónias
1934 Sandino o la tragedia de un pueblo. Madrid: Talleres Tipográficas Europa.

Sanchez, Porfirio
1983 "Personal Correspondence (1928). "El Sandinismo: documentos básicos. Ed. Manuel Mejía. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

Sandino, Augusto César
1980 Escritos literarios y documentos desconocidos. Ed. by Jorge Eduardo Arellaño. No publishing information.

1981a El pensamiento vivo de Sandino. Tomo 1. Ed. by Sergio Ramírez. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

1981b El pensamiento vivo de Sandino, Tomo 2. Ed. by Sergio Ramírez. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

1988 “Political Manifesto July 1, 1927.” Sandino Without Frontiers. Ed. by Karl Bermann. Hampton, VA: Compita Publishing, 48-51.

1988 "To Gustavo Alemán Bolaños, March 16, 1933." Sandino Without Frontiers. Ed. by Karl Bermann. Hampton, VA: Compita Publishing, 101-102.

1990 Sandino: The Testimony of a Nicaraguan Patriot, 1921-1934. Ed. by Sergio Ramírez. Ed. & Trans. by Robert Edgar Conrad. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

"Sandino Accused of Revolt Plot"
1934 New York Times, 1 March 1934: 7.

"Sandino Aide is Hunted"
1935 New York Times, 4 May 1935: 12.

"Sandino Breaks With Turcios"
1929 New York Times, 29 January 1929: 21.

"Sandino Captures American Mines; Takes 5 Workers"
1928 New York Times, 24 April 1928: 1.

"Sandino Emerges and Makes Peace"
1933 New York Times, 3 February 1933: 1, 12.

"Sandino Exalted by Sacasa Envoy"
1928 New York Times, 5 January 1928: 2.

"Sandino Fighting Again in Nicaragua"
1930 New York Times, 19 June 1930: 6.

"Sandino in Hiding: 'Army' Deserts Him."
1927 New York Times, 20 July 1927: 1, 2.

"Sandino is Killed by Managua Guard; 3 Aides Also Slain"
1934 New York Times, 23 February 1934: 1, 4.

"Sandino is Reported Aiming at Managua"
1932 New York Times, 26 February 1932: 10.

"Sandino Plans Return"
1930 New York Times, 12 January 1930: II, 4.

"Sandino Proposes Truce"
1933 New York Times, 19 January 1933: 7.

"Sandino Provokes a War on Himself"
1929 New York Times, 16 January 1929: 5.

"Sandino, Rebel, Destroys a Mine."
1927 New York Times, 12 September 1927: 25.

"Sandino Rebels Take Port in Nicaragua; Hoover for Caution"
1931 New York Times, 16 April 1931: 1, 9.

"Sandino Seeks Peace"
1933 New York Times, 8 January 1933: 12.

"Sandino Still a Peril, Marine Officers Say"
1929 New York Times, 11 February 1929: 6.

"Sandino Submits"
1933 New York Times, 4 February 1933: 14.

"Sandino Tells of Battles"
1932 New York Times, 16 June 1932: 5.

"Sandino to Fight On"
1930 New York Times, 29 January 1930: 10.

"Sandino to Yield Arms Says Wife in Nicaragua"
1933 New York Times, 7 January 1933: 4.

"Sandino Visits Managua"
1933 New York Times, 17 February 1933: 4.

"Sandino Voices Threat"
1932 New York Times, 22 August 1932: 6.

"Sandino Welcomed at Merida"
1929 New York Times, 12 July 1929: 4.

"Sandino's Mother Backs His Foe for Presidency"
1934 New York Times, 7 June 1934: 1.

"Says Aides Quit Sandino"
1929 New York Times, 8 February 1929; 3.

"Says Sandino Served with Villa in Mexico"
1928 New York Times, 6 January 1928: 3.

Schiffer, Irvine
1973 Charisma: A Psychoanalytic Look at Mass Society. Toronto: The University of Toronto Press.

Schmidt, Hans
1987 Maverick Marine: General Smedley D. Butler and the Contradictions of American Military History. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.

Schwartz, Barry, Yael Zerubavel, & Bernice M. Barnett
1986 "The Recovery of Masada: A Study in Collective Memory." The Sociological Quarterly, 27: 147-164.

Scott, Joan W.
1986 "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." American Historical Review, 91: 1053-1075.

Scott, Marvin B. & Stanford M. Lyman
1968 "Accounts." American Sociological Review, Feb. 1968: 46-62.

Selser, Gregorio
1981 Sandino, General of the Free. (1958) New York: Monthly Review Press.

1981 Apuntes sobre Nicaragua. Mexico City: Editorial Nueva Imagen.

1984 Nicaragua de Walker a Somoza. Mexico City: Mex-Sur Editorial, S.A.

1986 El pequeño ejéricito loco. (1957) Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

"Senate Acts to Ban force in Nicaragua"
1929 New York Times, 23 February 1929: 1.

"Senator Scores Warfare"
1927 New York Times, 20 July 1927: 2.

Shils, Edward
1975 Center and Periphery: Essays in Macrosociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

"Ships at Canal Rush to Nicaragua's Aid"
1931 New York Times, 1 April 1931: 2.

Sjoberg, Gideon, Elizabeth A. Gill, & Leonard D. Cain
2003 "Countersystem Analysis and the Construction of Alternative Futures." Sociological Theory, 21: 210-233.

Skocpol, Theda
1979 States & Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia & China. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

"Slight to Sandino Back of His Revolt"
1928 New York Times, 8 January 1928: 29.

Smelser, Neil
1962 Theory of Collective Behavior. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Smith, Robert Freeman
1972 The United States and Revolutionary Nationalism in Mexico, 1916-1932. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.

Snarr, Neil and Associates
1989 Sandinista Nicaragua, Part I: Revolution, Religion and Social Policy An Annotated Bibliography with Analytical Introductions. Ann Arbor, MI: Pierian Press.

Snow, David A.
2004 "Framing Processes, Ideology, and Discursive Fields." The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements. Ed. by David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, & Hanspeter Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford, Jr., Steven K. Worden, & Robert D. Benford
1986 "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation." American Sociological Review 51: 464- 481.

"Somosa [sic] to Head Nicaraguan Guard"
1932 New York Times, 16 November 1932: 4.

Somoza Debayle, Anastasio
1980 Nicaragua Betrayed. Boston: Western Islands Publishers.

Suarez Lopez, Gerardo
1971 Somoza, el lider de Nicaragua. Managua: Litografía San José.

Somoza García, Anastasio
1936 El verdadero Sandino o el Calvario de las Segovias. Managua: Tipografía Robelo.
"Somoza's Nation Called His Fief"
1956 New York Times, 30 September 1956: 3.

Stallings, Barbara
1987 Banker to the Third World: US Portfolio Investment in Latin America, 1900-1986. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Stark, Louis
1930 "Says Risks of War Continue in Europe," New York Times, 20 August 1930: 20.

Stimson, Henry L.
1927 American Policy in Nicaragua. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Stimson, Henry L. & McGeorge Bundy
1947 On Active Service in Peace and War. New York: Harper & Brothers.

"Stimson Defends Change in His Nicaraguan Policy; Disturbed by Opposition"
1931 New York Times, 19 April 1931: 1, 2.

"Stimson Issues Warning"
1931 New York Times, 18 April 1931: 1, 12.

"Stimson to Discuss Nicaraguan Status"
1931 New York Times, 25 January 1931: 2.

Strauss, Anselm L.
1959 Mirrors and Masks: The Search for Identity. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Swansbrough, Robert H.
1976 The Embattled Colossus: Economic Nationalism and United States Investors in Latin America. Gainesville, Florida: The University Presses of Florida.

Tarrow, Sidney
1988 "National Politics and Collective Action: Recent Theory and Research in Western Europe and the United States." Annual Review of Sociology 14: 421 - 440.

"The Marines"
1931 New York Times, 6 April 1931: 20.

"The Marines in Nicaragua"
1931 New York Times, 16 April 1931: 24.

"The Nicaragua Settlement"
1927 New York Times, 9 May 1927: 20.

"Thirty Reported Killed"
1931 New York Times, 17 April 1931: 18.

Thomas, Lowell
1933 Old Gimlet Eye: The Adventures of Smedley D. Butler. New York: Farrar & Rinehart.

"Threat Confirmed Against Nicaragua; Opens New Policy"
1927 New York Times, 8 May 1927: 1,21.

"Threatens to Burn Nicaraguan Towns"
1931 New York Times, 7 January 1931: 2.

Tilly, Charles
1975 "Revolutions and Collective Violence." Handbook of Political Science (vol. 3). Ed. by Reed Greenstein & Nelson Polsby. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley" 463-555.

1978 From Mobilization to Revolution. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

2004 Social Movements, 1768 - 2004. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Tirado López, Victor
1980 "El pensamiento político de Carlos Fonseca Amador." Nicaragua: La Estrategía de la Victoria. Ed. Fernando Carmona. Mexico City: Editorial Nuestro Tiempo, 123-128.

"To Remove Tampico Oil Equipment"
1927 New York Times, 6 October 1927: 39.

Tonness, Alfred
1932 "A Notation on the Problem of the Past - With Especial Reference to George Herbert Mead." The Journal of Philosophy 29: 599-606.

Touraine, Alain
1971 The May Movement: Revolt and Reform. Trans. by Leonard F.X. Mayhew. New York: Random House.

1977 The Self-Production of Society. Trans. by Derek Coltman. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

1981 The Voice and the Eye: An Analysis of Social Movements. Trans. Alan Duff. New York: Cambridge University Press.

1988 The Return of the Actor: Social Theory in Post-Industrial Society. Trans. by Myrna Godzich. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Trinchera
1978 Trinchera: Órgano oficial del Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional, 29 September 1978.

1979 Trinchera: Órgano oficial del Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional, 5 February 1979.

"Truce in Nicaragua Is Won by Stimson"
1927 New York Times, 7 May 1927: 1, 4.

Tucker, Robert C.
1968 "The Theory of Charismatic Leadership." Daedulus 97: 731-756.

Tumarkin, Nina
1983 Lenin Lives! Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Tunnermann Bernheim, Carlos
1983 El pensamiento político de la revolución popular sandinista. Managua: Centro Nacional de Materiales Educativos.

Turner, Ralph H. & Lewis M. Killian
1957 Collective Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

"Ultimatum Sent to Nicaraguan Rebel"
1927 New York Times, 13 July 1927: 10.

UNESCO
1966 World Communications: Press, Radio, Television, Film. New York: UNESCO Publications Center.

Unknown authors
1934 "A cantarles voy, senores." Con Sandino en Nicaragua. Ed. Ramón de Be lausteguigoitia. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 164.

1934 "Somos los libertadores (192?)." Con Sandino en Nicaragua. Ed. Ramón de Belausteguigoitia. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 166.

1983 "Hoy veintiuno de febrero." (no date) El Sandinismo: documentos básicos. Ed. Manuel Mejía Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, 160.

Váldes, Ignacio
1983 "Oración a AC Sandino." El Sandinismo: documentos básicos. Ed. Manuel Mejía. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, 227-228.

"Varied Tales Told of Sandino's Death"
1934 New York Times, 2 September 1934: 8.

Vega Bolanos, Andrés
1954 Documentos para la historia de Nicaragua, Colección Somoza. Madrid: Impresa Viuda de Galo Sáez.

Villard, Oswald Garrison
1939 Fighting Years: Memoirs of a Liberal Editor. New York? Harcourt, Brace & Company.

Walker, Thomas W.
1982 Nicaragua: The Land of Sandino. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel
1982 "World Systems Analysis: Theoretical and Interpretation Issues." World-Systems Analysis: Theory and Methodology. Beverly Hills: Sage, 91-103.

Wallis, Roy & Steve Bruce
1986 Sociological Theory, Religion and Collective Action. Belfast, Northern Ireland: The Queen's University.

Walter, Knut
1993 The Regime of Anastasio Somoza, 1936 - 1956. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

"War Council to Act in Sandino Slaying"
1934 New York Times, 26 February 1934: 6.

"War Was Barbaric, Stimson Reports"
1927 New York Times, 24 May 1927: 9.

"Washington Ends Task in Nicaragua"
1933 New York Times, 2 January 1933: 14.

"Washington Shuns Move in Nicaragua"
1936 New York Times, 5 June 1936: 11.

Weber, Henri
1983 "The Nicaraguan Background." The Nicaragua Reader. Ed. by Peter Rosset & John Vandermeer. New York: Grove Press, Inc.

Weber, Max
1922 The Sociology of Religion. Boston: Beacon Press.

1947 The Theory of Economic and Social Organization. New York: Oxford University Press.

1958 From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Ed. H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press.

1968 Max Weber on Charisma and Institution Building. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wheelock Roman, Jaime
1980a Frente sandinista: Hacia la ofensiva final. Managua: Editorial de Ciencias Sociales.

1980b "La revolución nicaragüense es nacional y fundamentalmente anti-imperialista." Managua: Secretaría Nacional de Propoganda y Educación del FSLN.

1981 Imperialismo y dictadura (1975). Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.

1982 Diciembre victorioso (1976). Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

1983 El gran desafío. Managua: Editorial Nueva Nicaragua.

Whisnant, David E.
1995 Rascally Signs in Sacred Places: The Politics of Culture in Nicaragua. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Williams, Mary Wilhelmine
1916 Anglo-American Isthmian Diplomacy 1815-1915. Baltimore: The Lord Baltimore Press.

Williams, Whiting
1927a "Fighting in Nicaragua is a Bitter Necessity." New York Times, 21 August 1927: VIII, 5, 6.

1927b "Our Ways and Wares in Nicaragua." New York Times, 3 July 1927: 10, 11.

Willner, Ann Ruth
1984 The Spellbinders. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Wilson, Charles Morrow
1947 Empire in Green and Gold. USA: Henry Holt and Company.

"Withdrawing the Marines"
1931 New York Times, 14 February 1931: 16.

Wren, Daniel
1987 White Collar Hobo: The Travels of Whiting Williams. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.

Young, Michael P.
2002 “Confessional Protest: The Religious Birth of U.S. National Social Movements.” American Sociological Review 67, 660-688.

Zald, Mayer N. & Roberta Ash
1964 “Social Movement Organization: Growth, Decay, and Change.” Social Forces 44: 327-341.

1996 “Culture, ideology and strategic framing.” Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings. Ed. by Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald. New York: Cambridge University Press.261-274..

Zimmerman, Matilde
2000 Sandinista, Carlos Fonseca and the Nicaraguan Revolution. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Zurcher, Louis & David Snow
1981 "Collective Behavior: Social Movements." Social Psychology. Eds. Morris Rosenberg & Ralph Turner. New York: Sociological Basic Books, Inc.

VITA

Nancy A. Campbell-Jeffrey was born in Norman, Oklahoma on December 29, 1955, the daughter of Faye Neff Campbell and Gene Campbell. After completing her work at Northwest Classen High School, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma in 1974, she entered Central State University in Edmond, Oklahoma. Beginning in 1976, she was employed in retail management for several years and then taught in the Venezuelan Baptist Theological Seminary in Los Teques, Venezuela. In 1982 she entered Oklahoma State University in Stillwater, Oklahoma. She received the degree of Bachelor of Arts from Oklahoma State University in December, 1985. In September 1986, she entered The Graduate School of The University of Texas, receiving the Master of Arts degree from The University of Texas in December 1989. During the following years, she was employed at Trinity University, Southern Methodist University, Central Methodist University and William Woods University as a sociology instructor. She was also employed at the University of Missouri as a Spanish instructor.

Permanent Address: 209 E. Briarwood Lane, Columbia, MO 65203

This dissertation was typed by the author.